

# THE Catholic Mind

VOL. L

MAY, 1952

NO. 1073

## Negro Challenge to the Church

JAMES F. DIDAS, S.S.J.

*Reprinted from the SHIELD\**

**D**URING World War II, a noteworthy poster was displayed prominently in public places. Under the caption, "Someone Talked," a vessel with men aboard was shown sinking beneath the waves. Probably many people heeded that forceful message. They refrained from gossip which might give the enemy valuable information that could result in the loss of men and materiel.

Losses, unfortunately, have occurred in the Catholic Church because "Someone Talked." One day three persons were coming out of a large Catholic church in the North. Two were white and the third was colored. Whether this was the first time a Negro has appeared at the

church, we do not know. Nor should it have mattered! One of the white churchgoers was overheard remarking to the other, "What's he (meaning the Negro) doing *here*?" That un-Christlike bit of talk caused the colored man to feel unwelcome and unwanted in that Catholic church, and he did not go back. For years he refused to practice his religion—because "Someone Talked."

The tragic part is that this is no isolated case. Un-Christlike words and deeds by Catholics frequently cause Negroes to give up their religion because of disillusionment, disappointment and despair. Sometimes, as in the case mentioned above, the person returns to the sacraments

\* Crusade Castle, Shattuck Ave., Cincinnati 26, Ohio, March, 1952.

before death. More often, however, offended individuals never come back to the Catholic Church, but "join" another religion because they cannot believe that true followers of the teachings of Jesus Christ would practice prejudice against persons of any race, color, or nationality.

### GRAVE SIN

White Catholics who discriminate against Negroes or anyone else fail to act in accord with the commands of Christ, the teachings of the Popes, the Constitution and common sense. Such persons can be guilty of grave sin because they not only impede the work of conversion, but also drive Catholics out of the Church. Especially true in the matter of religion are these words of the Negro who said:

"If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I lack knowledge, I can become educated. But if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me that. I have no protection against race prejudice but to take refuge in cynicism, bitterness and hatred.

The conversion of the Negroes in the United States has been specifically designated as "Catholic America's Number One Mission Responsibility." Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical, *Sertum Laetitiae*, addressed to the American

Bishops, used these words in reference to this mission work:

We confess that We feel a special paternal affection, which is certainly inspired of Heaven, for the Negro people dwelling among you; for in the field of religion and education We know they need special care and comfort and are deserving of it. We therefore invoke an abundance of heavenly blessing and We pray fruitful success for those whose generous zeal is devoted to their welfare.

This statement of His Holiness is a challenge not only to those who show discrimination, but also to all who give merely passive recognition to "Catholic America's Number One Mission Responsibility." Do-nothingism is no better than indifference. A substantial increase in the annual yield of converts cannot be expected until white Catholics in increasing numbers show positive interest in the evangelization of the Negroes in our country.

Positive interest can be shown to those who are already Catholics and members of your own parish by inviting them to participate in all parochial groups, such as altar boys, choir, Holy Name Society and Sodality. Surely this type of recognition would be a greater encouragement than assuming a non-committal attitude or indulging in the practice of separation of the races by designating different doors for entry to the church, assigning definite places for white and colored members of the congregation, and ap-

pointing the particular time each group should approach the communion rail. Such distinctions, and others of a similar nature, are a mockery of our common claim to God as our Father, Mary as our Mother and our own membership in the Mystical Body of Christ.

In a recently published book entitled *Living the Mass*, the author, Father Desplanques, brings this teaching of oneness to our attention while explaining the priest's prayer after the Offertory beginning: "Pray, brethren." Says Father Desplanques: "There must be present now—only 'brothers' and 'sisters' in Christ. . . . No quarrels! No rancor! No bitterness among families, among classes. There must be unity, for the full power of the Sacrifice."

Negroes judge the Catholic Church by the members with whom they come in contact. A non-Catholic, James Egard Allen, voiced his impressions of a visit to Rome during the Holy Year:

I was struck by the Church's inclusiveness. There was not the slightest hint of racial preference anywhere. Negroes and whites, browns and yellows, all were part of Rome's pilgrim tide.

Because we are constituted our brother's keepers and none may remain unconcerned about another's

welfare, Negroes will be drawn to or repelled from the Church by the concern of Catholics for the inequalities and second-class citizenship accorded members of the colored race. Catholics may not bar the doors of opportunity to Negro graduates, mechanics, artisans and laborers. In Catholic schools, Negro children and white children should be accepted on the same basis.

### THE BISHOPS SPEAK

The uncompromising stand of several bishops in this regard, together with resolutions drawn up at the last meeting of the Catholic Committee of the South, have added greatly to the prestige of the Catholic Church in the minds of non-Catholic Negroes, especially members of the press. As an example, here is the concluding paragraph of an editorial found in a Negro newspaper after the announcement by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter that there would no longer be separate Catholic schools for Negro students in his archdiocese:

In the city of St. Louis, it thus becomes perfectly clear that the Catholic Church is giving to the nation a practical demonstration of what can be done to make Christianity a living reality and to make progress toward the American

ideal of equality, when there is sufficient will and determination to achieve these goals about which there is so much talk and far too little action.

Students, as well as schools, must accept courteously enrollees of all racial groups. Within the past few months, a Negro who graduated in June from a Catholic college in the North entered a cloistered community in the South. In telling of her college experiences, she said: "From the very first day I entered to the day I left, I found (the college) to be exactly what it claims to be—a Catholic university. Not just Catholic in doctrine, but Catholic in action." A few weeks ago, the priest-dean of Belmont Abbey College in North Carolina, a Southern State, told an audience in a Northern State: "We have never had a student whose attitude (on interracial justice) did not improve. Given the opportunity, many are ready to go out and do something about it."

Prejudices seem to disappear at first-hand knowledge of members of other races. A colored girl from Texas attending Nazareth College in Rochester, N. Y., told of her first reaction upon discovering that a white girl from the South was also enrolled:

I was sure she wanted nothing to do with me and I decided I wanted nothing to do with her; so I avoided her as much as possible, and apparently she avoided me. But after a time, the situation began to be irritating, since it put

a strain on an otherwise free and happy existence—and also because in my heart I knew I was not doing the right thing. So I began to speak to her whenever I saw her, deliberately to sit by her on the bus or in the restaurant, to smile at her across a room; and strangely enough then, slowly—without our realizing it—we were breaking down the barriers between us. She began visiting my room and I, hers, until, near the end of the year, she was one of my best friends; and she still is. Then one night, just before the end of the school year, we had a long talk on the race problem, and we settled many things and discovered many things about ourselves.

While you, the reader, will not be able to bring about an immediate cessation of discrimination, the beginning must be made in yourself and among your immediate associates. Meantime, it is well to become familiar with the teachings of the Catholic Church on social justice, and to understand the objectives to be attained. Some students have already indicated by public resolutions that they desire to do something positive. The National Federation of Catholic College Students, for example, went on record with the following statement:

We should recognize the danger of apathy and inertia and be alert to the role we can play as Catholics and as Americans. Therefore, as the representative student delegates from twenty-three colleges, we strongly urge that all Catholic college graduates consider how they can best become, within their own environment, effective advocates of social justice and interracial justice.



### STUDENT ACTION

The NFCCS resolution was in line with numerous resolutions adopted at national conventions of the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade. The 1950 Crusade convention, reaffirming all preceding enactments, urged all members of the CSMC "to engage, individually and actively, in all movements aimed at the betterment of Negro-white relationships and the full integration of Negroes into the American community." It was significant that the resolution, introduced by Mary Lou Fitzmayer of Ursuline College, Louisville, bore the simple title, "On the Missions of the United States."

Nor should we fail to mention here the vigorous action proposed against racial discrimination by Father John F. Cronin, of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (Washington, D. C.). At a meeting of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, held during October, 1951, in Columbus, Ohio, Father Cronin said:

First, we would consider the most important evils, such as job discrimination, inadequate housing and medical care, and inferior educational opportunities. Secondly, we would develop short-range and long-range objectives, depending on the attitude and prejudices in our communities. Over the long range, we would educate people to a complete acceptance of the Christian view of their fellowman. This is particularly a task for the schools and the

churches. But in the immediate future, we should seek both by education and by law to give minority groups equal opportunities in the field of employment, housing, medical care and schooling. We should vigilantly protect their civil rights.

Finally, let us consider briefly why it is important (in addition to avoiding sin) for Catholics to be free from racial prejudice. The latest census figures reveal that there are 15 million Negroes in the United States. Of this number approximately 400,000 are Catholics. This means that about one in every forty Negroes belongs to the True Church, whereas in the total population one person out of five is a Catholic. Hence the proportion of Negro Catholics is only one-eighth that of non-Negro Catholics. A comparison between parts of America and parts of Africa would reveal, for instance, that in the Belgian Congo one Negro in four is a Catholic, while in Mississippi, one Negro in two hundred belongs to the Catholic Church. Realization of how much "preaching the Gospel by word and work" remains to be done should convince everyone that the colored missions are "Catholic America's Number One Mission Responsibility."

Vocations are sorely needed for our Negro missions. The Josephite Fathers, who have devoted themselves to this mission field since 1871, are the founders of the organized apostolate among colored Americans, and their 135 missions extend from

Boston to San Antonio. An encouraging feature of this apostolate is the growing number of religious communities which have in recent years accepted Negro missions.

More Negro converts, we believe, would be won by the missionaries if white Catholics, especially our young people, would determine to take to heart the following ten recommendations for positive action:

1. In study clubs, the Negro should be made a theme of earnest study.

2. A change of attitude toward the colored begins with acts of courtesy, which St. Francis of Assisi called "the younger sister of charity." We hate those we harm, but we tend to love those we have helped.

3. Know colored employees, not merely as servants, but as fellow seekers of the Kingdom of Heaven. If they are Catholics and have a mission church, go to visit it and contribute sometimes to its needs.

4. Offer yourself to the priests of

the mission to teach the Catechism.

5. The colored would be encouraged if you joined worthy interracial agencies, e.g., a Catholic interracial council, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Urban League; or if you interested yourself in the work of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation.<sup>1</sup>

6. Withhold the tongue from criticizing and extend the hand to help.

7. Do not be disgusted if a colored person over-expresses himself—the race has been under-expressed for centuries.

8. Protest lynchings, race riots and other expressions of gross racial injustice.

9. Refuse to be guilty of the fallacy of "blaming all colored people for the faults of some."

10. For the sake of God, our beloved country and our Holy Church, at all times and to all people: "Be Fair."

---

<sup>1</sup> The Catholic Interracial Council (20 Vesey St., New York, N. Y.) bases its program for interracial justice on fourteen "postulates," which view the problems involved from the standpoint of universally accepted Christian principles of justice and widely accepted theories on racial origins, which minimize the differences between different groups; the December, 1951, issue of the Council's magazine, *Interracial Review*, listed branch councils in seventeen localities. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is chiefly Negro in membership; its chief concern is to protect the social and economic rights of the colored people. The Urban League is concerned chiefly with employment and discrimination in the fields of employment; while it is a national organization, the League operates primarily on a local and civic basis. The Commission on Interracial Cooperation aims principally at prevention and easing of interracial tension in individual communities; it is a national organization, but local branches may use various names.

# In God We Trust

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

*An address to the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen,  
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1951.*

I AM happy to have the privilege of speaking to this meeting of the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen. You have come to the nation's Capital to visit its monuments and to look at the basic documents on which our Government was founded. Many people come to Washington to do these things, but you have come here for a special purpose. You have come here to emphasize the fact that this nation was founded on religious principles.

You will see, as you make your rounds, that this nation was established by men who believed in God. You will see that our Founding Fathers believed that God created this nation. And I believe it, too. They believed that God was our strength in time of peril and the source of all our blessings.

You will see the evidence of this deep religious faith on every hand.

If we go back to the Declaration of Independence, we notice that it was drawn up by men who believed that God the Creator had made all men equal and had given them certain rights which no man could take away. In beginning their great en-

terprise, the signers of the Declaration of Independence entrusted themselves to the protection of Divine Providence.

To our forefathers, it seemed something of a miracle that this nation was able to go through the agonies of the American Revolution and emerge triumphant. They saw, in our successful struggle for independence, the working of God's hand. In his First Inaugural Address, George Washington said: "No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand, which conducts the affairs of men, more than the people of the United States."

## RELIGIOUS FREEDOM STRESSED

Another fact which you will notice in the course of your pilgrimage is that the makers of our Constitution believed in religious toleration. Theirs was the highest type of religion, forbidding the use of coercion or force in matters of the mind and spirit. Religious freedom was a part of their religious faith.

And they received that from Roger Williams, the Baptist; from William Penn, the Quaker, and from Lord

Baltimore, a Catholic. That's the reason for our Constitutional approach to religious freedom.

It is said that when Benjamin Franklin left the Constitutional Convention he was asked, "What have you given us?" He answered, "A republic, if you can keep it." Millions of Americans since then have believed that the keeping of our Republic depends upon keeping the deep religious convictions on which it was founded.

From the worship and teachings of the synagogues and churches of our land have come a moral integrity, a concern for justice and human welfare, a sense of human equality, a love of human freedom and a practice of brotherhood which are necessary to the life of our national institutions.

It is fitting and proper that at this time of international peril and uncertainty we should look back to these beginnings and rededicate ourselves to these ideals.

It is not enough, however, simply to look back. It is not enough to congratulate ourselves upon the religious spirit of our forebears. We must ask ourselves if we truly believe the things which they believed. We must examine our conduct to see whether we are carrying out in our daily lives the ideals we profess.

This is not easy. Our religious heritage imposes great obligations upon us. It does not permit us to be

self-satisfied and complacent. Indeed, if we accept the faith which has been handed down to us, our task as a nation is much more difficult. We cannot be satisfied with things as they are. We must always be striving to live up to our beliefs and make things better in accordance with the Divine Commandments.

The people of Israel, you will remember, did not, because of their covenant with God, have an easier time than other nations. Their standards were higher than those of other nations and the judgment upon them and their shortcomings was more terrible. A religious heritage, such as ours, is not a comfortable thing to live with. It does not mean that we are more virtuous than other people. Instead, it means we have less excuse for doing the wrong thing, because we are taught right from wrong.

### RESPONSIBILITIES

Our religious heritage, in my opinion, imposes great responsibilities upon us as we face the problems of today.

It means first of all that we must constantly strive for social justice in the life of this Republic. It means that we must fight against special privilege, against injustice to those of low income, against the denial of opportunity, against discrimination based on race, creed or national origin.

Our religious heritage also means

that we must struggle to maintain our civil liberties. No nation which hopes to live by the law of God can afford to suppress dissent and criticism. You may remember that Israel persecuted the prophets. The prophets had unpleasant things to say about what was going on in ancient Israel. They criticized social injustice and the wasteful luxury of the privileged few.

They criticized the way in which the ancient Hebrews had turned away from true religious principles. They said that Israel would be punished for its misdeeds. The prophets were not popular, and the kings and the priests of Israel tried to deny them freedom of speech. But the prophets were right, and Israel was punished as they had said it would be.

We must always keep the way open for self-criticism. We must not stop up the mouths of those who are saying unpopular things. We must preserve the Bill of Rights, so that the voice of protest and dissent may always be heard. We must not try to destroy people by fear and slander, because if we do we shall weaken the moral fiber of our country.

#### DEEDS CALLED REAL TEST

Another great lesson which our religious heritage has for us today is that we must not be led astray by self-righteousness. We must remember that the test of our religious principles lies not just in what we say,

not only in our prayers, not even in living blameless personal lives—but in what we do for others.

It is all too easy for church-going people to be satisfied with a superficial standard of morals. It is all too easy to sit in judgment on the shortcomings of others. It is all too easy to feel morally superior because we go to church and profess to follow the faith of our fathers.

We must remember that in His ministry on earth Jesus delivered His strongest condemnations against those who were superficially good. The scribes and the Pharisees He attacked were the respectable people of His day. They were the leaders of the community who set the standards for others. To them He said: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

Self-interest can blind us today, just as it blinded the scribes and Pharisees of Biblical times. We must always be on our guard against this danger.

If we are to respond to our religious heritage, we must be guided by the principle of charity—charity in the Biblical sense of love for one's fellow man. This is the greatest virtue, without which other virtues are of little worth.

We must work for morality in public life and in private life. You can't make an honest man by law. He has

to be raised by the rules in the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus and the Sermon on the Mount if he has the right moral fiber to become an ethical public or private citizen. We must stamp out crime, and eliminate corruption. We must have high standards of personal conduct.

But even if we do all these things, that still is not enough. The final question that will be asked of us, as individuals and as a society, is: "what have we done for our fellow man?" What have we done to ease his burdens, to give him greater opportunity, to help him in time of trouble, and to make the world a better place for him to live in? For unless we can answer those questions, we will not have carried out in our lives the religious heritage which has come to us from our forefathers.

Today, our problem is not just to preserve our religious heritage in our own lives and our own country. Our problem is a greater one. It is to preserve a world civilization in which man's belief in God can survive. Only in such a world can our own nation follow its basic traditions, and realize the promise of a better life for all our citizens.

Today, the whole human enterprise is in danger. On the one hand, we have to resist the expansion of a power that is hostile to all we believe in. It is a power that denies the rule of law, the value of the individual, and belief in God. It is a

power which has become militant and aggressive, using the weapons of deceit and subversion as well as military might.

On the other hand, we must do all we can to prevent the outbreak of another world war. Such a war, using modern instruments of destruction, would be more terrible than anything we have ever experienced. It would make a battleground of the crowded and complex cities of the modern world. It might well shatter our whole economic and social system, and plunge mankind back into barbarism.

This is the great problem we must meet. We cannot yield to Soviet Communism without betraying the ideals we live for. We cannot have a new world war without jeopardizing our civilization.

### FAITH IN GOD

In this perilous strait our greatest source of strength, our greatest hope of victory, lies in the God we acknowledge as the ruler of all. We turn to faith in Him to give us the strength and the wisdom to carry out His will. We ask Him to lead us out of the dangers of this present time into the paths of peace.

In this crisis of human affairs, all men who profess a belief in God should unite in asking His help and His guidance. We should lay aside our differences and come together now—for never have our differences

seemed so petty and insignificant as they do in the face of the peril we confront today.

It is not just this church or that church which is in danger. It is not just this creed or that creed which is threatened. All churches, all creeds, are menaced. The very future of the word of God—the teaching that has come down to us from the days of the prophets and the life of Jesus—is at stake.

For some time I have been trying to bring a number of the great religious leaders of the world together in a common affirmation—and that common affirmation, as I said a while ago, is in the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus, and in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Chapters of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, the Sermon on the Mount—of faith and a common supplication to the one God that all profess. I have asked them to join in one common act which will affirm those religious and moral principles on which all agree.<sup>1</sup>

### A BOND OF BROTHERHOOD

Such an affirmation would testify to the strength of our common faith and our confidence in its ultimate victory over the forces that oppose it.

I am sorry to say that it has not yet been possible to bring the religious faiths together for the purpose

of bearing witness in one united affirmation that God is the way of truth and peace. Even the Christian churches have not yet found themselves able to say, with one voice, that Christ is their Master and Redeemer and the source of their strength against the hosts of irreligion and danger to the world and that will be the cause of world catastrophe. They haven't been able to agree on as simple a statement as that. I have been working at it for years.

Despite the barriers that divide the different churches, there is a common bond of brotherhood that underlies them all. We must continue our effort to find those common ties, and to bring the churches together in greater unity in a crusade for peace. In this way, we shall come closer to the one God who is the father of us all. In this way, we shall find greater power to meet the troubles of our time.

The way to such unity is long and hard. But we must continue to strive for it. And we must ask God's help. If we really have faith, perhaps God will give us what we are not able to attain by our own efforts.

God grant that we may speak together, as brothers, of His power and His mercy, and bear witness of Him against those who deny Him.

And may God unite the churches, and the free world, to bring us peace in our time.

---

<sup>1</sup> *America* commented on this proposal in its issue of Oct. 13, 1951, pp. 34-35.

# The Canadian Family Allowance System

THOMAS H. USHER

*Reprinted from REVIEW OF SOCIAL ECONOMY\**

CONTINENTAL Europe provided the backdrop for the drama of the development of the family allowance system. On a private scale this development may be traced from its beginning in the France of 1840<sup>1</sup> as a means of supplementing family income during periods of rising prices to its populationist application by totalitarian states as part and parcel of their expansionist policies.<sup>2</sup>

The actual practice of paying, in addition to customary wages, certain allowances for children and/or wives grew out of the economic conditions prevailing during and after World War I, though vestiges of it existed in selected occupations, particularly agriculture, even before 1914.<sup>3</sup> In the decade 1920-30, the family allowance scheme was given its initial trial on a national scale when it was adopted in France and Belgium.<sup>4</sup> In England, Sir William Beveridge adopted a sys-

tem of family allowances for the teaching staff of the London School of Economics as early as 1926,<sup>5</sup> thus expressing his practical faith in the scheme and foreshadowing his famous *Report on Social Security* in which he embodies the imperative of children's allowances.<sup>6</sup> He had the vision to foresee the enactment of family allowances in his own land on a national scale, for the United Kingdom now has a national system of family allowances. In fact, the idea has spread from its beginning to almost all corners of the globe, forty-two nations, including Canada, now having family allowances in some form.

The historical background of family allowances discussion in Canada has been a disjointed one. Various economic, social and political factors have contributed to bring the idea of family allowances to the fore as a

<sup>1</sup> Jean Pinte, *Les Allocations Familiales*, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup> *Family Allowances in Various Countries*, U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, p. 26. "Extension of Military Family Allowances in Germany," *Monthly Labor Review*, LVII, No. 6, December, 1943, pp. 1129-30.

<sup>3</sup> Eleanor F. Rathbone, *The Disinherited Family*, 3rd ed., p. 163.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14-102.

<sup>5</sup> Rathbone, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

<sup>6</sup> William H. Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*, pp. 6, 90, 104, 150, *passim*.

\* Marquette University Press, Milwaukee 3, Wis., September, 1951.



means of solving domestic problems, especially the persistent question of inadequate family income. The success of family allowance schemes abroad, in New Zealand, Australia, France and elsewhere, elicited determined, but unofficial, interest in the Dominion in the years immediately following World War I. Various cost-of-living and family budget studies were made during these years, among which those of Margaret Gould and the *Labor Gazette* were prominent. The figures revealed that from one-half to two-thirds of all children belonged to families with less than a maintenance level income. The average annual wage of workers in this period was found to be only \$971.00, whereas a consensus budget compiled among those who studied the problem quoted \$1,300.00 as the annual wage necessary for a family of five.<sup>7</sup>

In the French-speaking province of Quebec, interest in the family allowance plan became intense in the early part of the decade of 1930-40. In this province, incomes are, as a general rule, exceptionally low; yet Quebec possesses the largest families in Canada. The writings of Leon Lebel and others, the French and Belgium precedents in the realm of fam-

ily allowances and the Federal investigation<sup>8</sup> of family allocations had engendered by 1930 the Quebec Social Insurance Commission.<sup>9</sup> The Commission, after a two-year deliberation of the problem, came to the unanimous opinion that there was no opportunity at that time for the legal institution of such allowances in Quebec. Although the Commission went on record to the effect that it was in favor of family allowances in principle, it asserted that "it would be impossible and dangerous to extend family allowances to the whole population."<sup>10</sup>

For the next ten years, the subject of family allowances remained a dead issue in Canada. But upon the advent of World War II the dormant theme came to life when the *Quebec Collective Agreement Act* was amended in 1943 "... to add family allowances to the provisions of a collective agreement which may be made binding on employers and employees who were within the scope of the voluntary agreement."<sup>11</sup>

#### PUBLIC OPINION

Gradually, by progressive steps, public opinion expressed in pamphlets, feature articles, speeches and

<sup>7</sup> Leon Lebel, *Les Allocations Familiales*, pp. 26-9.

<sup>8</sup> *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*, Nos. 1-26, Dominion of Canada, 15th Parliament, 7th Session, Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations, pp. 112-4.

<sup>9</sup> *Family Allowances in Various Countries*, U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, p. 18.

<sup>10</sup> Charlotte Whitton, *The Dawn of Ampler Life*, p. 22.

<sup>11</sup> "The Quebec Plan," *The Labour Gazette*, XLIII, No. 7, July, 1943, pp. 1026-7.

other pronouncements began to be felt in official circles as World War II rolled onward. During the war, wages and prices were controlled in Canada earlier and more effectively than in the United States. The trade unions, caught in the inflationary-spiral, were restive, and pressed for wage increases. In 1943, an inquiry into the wage problem, which was made under the National War Labor Board, led to the suggestion of special allowances for children of the families of low wage earners, as an alternative to raising the general wage level. In the same year, Dr. Leonard C. Marsh prepared a semi-official report which recommended family allowances as one item in a social security plan for Canada. An obvious precedent for this proposal was the dual influence of the Beveridge Report and the system of allowances to the dependents of men in the armed forces, which had been in effect throughout the war.<sup>12</sup>

### ECONOMIC POLICIES

The economic argument for family allowances doubtless counted for much with the Government and its advisors. Progressively, the economic policies of Mr. King's Government had been influenced by the views of an able group of economists in several major departments in the

Bank of Canada, and in certain war agencies. These men were the architects of the system of planning and control which had raised war production to unprecedented levels at the same time that prices, wages and the cost of living were kept within reasonable bounds. As they looked ahead to the postwar period, they were much concerned with the problem of keeping production high, of raising greatly the level of consumption, of stimulating an increase in net national investment and of achieving the goal of "full employment."

The device of family allowances, calling for a great transfer of income from the prosperous to the poor, promised to go a long way towards sustaining consumption in the postwar period and, therefore, supporting employment, production and national income. The Government was almost forced to accept the position that family allowances represented a positive contribution towards the postwar goal of general economic prosperity and that the heavy costs would be partially met out of the increase in national income which it would generate.

Although the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada and the All-Canadian Congress of Labor had proclaimed, as early as 1929, that

<sup>12</sup> *The Report on Social Security for Canada*, Dominion of Canada, 19th Parliament, 3rd Session, Committee on Social Security, pp. 3-212.

<sup>13</sup> "Family Allowances," *The Labour Gazette*, XXIX, No. 12, December, 1929, p. 1364.

they favored family allowances,<sup>13</sup> the attitude of organized labor, with the possible exception of the *Confederation des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada*, was one of hostility, on the ground that the general wage level would be affected by family allowance legislation.

The Government, however, was willing to chance the final acceptance of the proposed Act by organized labor. Its faith in the conversion of the Canadian labor organizations to a belief in family allowances was justified after the actual passage of the legislation. At its annual convention held in Toronto on October 23, 1944, the Canadian Congress of Labour passed a resolution favoring family allowances in principle.<sup>14</sup>

#### THE CANADIAN FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT

At the conclusion of a rather tedious and acrimonious debate on children's allowances, during which time the Prime Minister enunciated in cogent detail the position the Gov-

ernment had taken,<sup>15</sup> Bill 161, officially known as *An Act to Provide for Family Allowances*, was put to a vote in the Canadian House of Commons. No member of the Parliament voted against the Act. Of a potential vote of 245, Bill 161 received a total of 139 votes, the balance of the members being conveniently absent during the count, which fact disturbed some Canadian authorities.<sup>16</sup>

The *Family Allowances Act, 1944*, became operative on July 1, 1945, the seventy-eighth anniversary of the Dominion of Canada.<sup>17</sup> Under this statute, a monthly family allowance is payable, from unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for each child resident in Canada under 16 years of age and maintained wholly or substantially by the parent. The scale of payment for the first four children may be indicated by the following table:

Age of the Child	Monthly Disbursement
From birth to 5 years . . . . .	\$5.00
From 6 to 9 years . . . . .	6.00

<sup>13</sup> "Convention of Labour Organizations," *The Labour Gazette*, XLIV, No. 11, November, 1944, p. 1931.

<sup>15</sup> "... May I say that the principle of this bill is not new; it has been recognized in our income tax legislation and also in dependents' allowances and veterans' widows' pensions . . . of all resources, human resources are the most important. . . . ("Family Allowances," *Debates*, Dominion of Canada, 19th Parliament, 5th Session, House of Commons, 8 George VI, CCXLIII, pp. 5328-5436.)

<sup>16</sup> "... The unanimous vote of the House of Commons as little reflects the actual situation as most other features associated with the whole undertaking. A vote of 139 'for' . . . over 100 absentees (40 per cent of the House) can no more be cited as proof of unanimity than the absence of actually clashing disunity can be taken as proof of unity." (Charlotte Whitton, *Baby Bonuses: Dollars or Sense*, pp. 18-20.)

<sup>17</sup> "An Act to Provide for Family Allowances," *Statutes*, Dominion of Canada, 19th Parliament, 8 George VI, Chapter 40, pp. 341-45.

From 10 to 12 years ..... 7.00  
 From 13 to 15 years ..... 8.00

Although the legislation originally provided a decreasing scale feature,<sup>18</sup> the continued opposition of both French-Canadian and CCF members<sup>19</sup> finally wielded sufficient power to have the Act amended in 1949, thus deleting the offensive clause.<sup>20</sup>

Thus a small family with three children aged 4, 8 and 12 respectively would receive \$18.00 monthly, making a yearly disbursement of \$216.00 to such a family unit. Similarly, the allowance that would be authorized under the Act to a large family with 8 children, ranging in age from 6 months to 15 years, would be \$51.00 monthly, the yearly disbursement totalling \$612.00.

The grants are payable only after registration of the child, and must be applied "exclusively towards the maintenance, care, training, education and advancement of the child." Grants are paid to the natural parents having the custody of the child, or alternatively to a relative, adoptive parent, or foster parent, but not to institutions.<sup>21</sup> It was decided administratively that the allowance should

be paid to the mother or to the female person, if any, taking the place of the mother. Eskimos and Indians are given separate consideration under the Act, the former being granted allowances in kind rather than in cash.

The allowance is discontinued when and if one or more of the following conditions prevail: 1) when the child reaches the age of 16; 2) if the Minister or other authorized officer is satisfied that grants are not properly applied; 3) when the child ceases to be a resident of Canada; 4) when the child dies; 5) when a female child marries; or 6) when the child does not regularly attend school as required by the laws of the province where he resides.<sup>22</sup> The scheme is entirely a Federal project, both financially and administratively, with the Government drawing heavily upon provincial and private welfare agencies for assistance in administration.

The allowance provided under the Act is not subject to taxation or to the operation of any law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency, which fact complicates the operation of the Department of National Revenue.

<sup>18</sup> For a fifth child maintained by the parent, the above rates of allowances were reduced by \$1.00; for the sixth and seventh children, by \$2.00 each; and for the eighth and subsequent children, by \$3.00 each. *Ibid.*, p. 342.

<sup>19</sup> "Family Allowances," *Debates, loc. cit.*, p. 5348.

<sup>20</sup> *Windsor Daily Star*, April 26, 1949.

<sup>21</sup> "Order in Council amending the Regulations made under Family Allowances Act," *P. C. 24, Canada Gazette*, Wednesday, January 22, 1947, p. 81357.

<sup>22</sup> "An Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1944," *Statutes*; Dominion of Canada, 20th Parliament, Chapter 50, pp. 235-36.

The benefits cannot be assigned, attached, anticipated, nor given as security.

#### LOW-INCOME FAMILIES BENEFIT FULLY

Although no means test is applied in granting family allowances and although a high proportion of all families in Canada are receiving allowances, only low-income families actually benefit to the fullest extent of the allowances; middle-income families realize only a partial financial gain, while upper-income families receive no net benefit. This is in accordance with a provision of the Act authorizing the elimination of duplication of benefits between family allowances and income tax credits for dependent children.

Duplication was eliminated in 1945 and 1946 through a provision in the income-tax regulations for recovery of part or all of the allowances paid to both middle-income and upper-income families. Those with incomes over \$3,000 annually did not gain from the scheme in 1945 and 1946. Those family heads with incomes less than \$1,200 benefited most from the operation of the Act. With each \$200 increase in annual income from the \$1,200 level, the recoverable portion of the family allowance paid to the recipient increased by 10 per cent. Thus, at the \$3,000 income level,

the recoverable portion of the allowance was 100 per cent.

The method for eliminating duplication of benefits between family allowances and income tax credits employed in 1945 and 1946 proved to be very cumbersome. An amendment to the *Income Tax Act*, effective January, 1947, eliminated many of the unwieldy administrative difficulties. Thus a taxpayer may claim no more credit for a dependent child who was eligible for family allowances but *not* registered than for a child for whom family allowances were received. The effect of this law was that all taxpayers with dependent children, including those in the upper-income brackets, suffer a loss if they do not register their children for family allowances.<sup>23</sup>

While this amendment has many advantages over the regulations in effect in 1945 and 1946, it carries what may be an unfortunate amount of compulsion toward participation in the program. Some authorities have suggested that a more appropriate approach might have been to regard family allowances as taxable income, and to treat the matter of deductions for dependent children as entirely separate from the family allowance program. In any event, the compulsory participation in the plan has had the effect of increasing almost to universal proportions the

<sup>23</sup> "An Act to amend the Income Tax Act," *Statutes*, Dominion of Canada, 20th Parliament, 2nd Session, 10 George VI, Chapter 55, pp. 294-95.

number of family units who would otherwise not be included under the scheme.<sup>24</sup>

Powers necessary to administer the family allowances program are given to the Minister of National Health and Welfare who, having Cabinet rank, makes an annual report to the Parliament on the operations of the scheme. He entrusts, however, the actual administration of his department to an appointed National Director of Family Allowances. The total staff of employees engaged by the Director all across Canada number some 1,160. The cost of administration approximates 2 per cent of the net cost of the family allowance program.<sup>25</sup>

Official statistical records of the Department of National Health and Welfare are complete for the period from July 1, 1945 to October 31, 1949. The figures reveal that since 1945 Canadian children have benefited from \$1,002,682,746 the Government has distributed in family allowances during the initial four-year period, with monthly disbursements reaching \$21,935,035.

Mathematicians will be glad to learn that the arithmetic mean of monthly allowances for each child

has been set by the Family Allowance Division at \$5.95; the average allowance disbursed to a Canadian family unit was \$13.48 monthly.

Critics of the family allowance program in Canada have vitriolically observed that the annual expenditure by the Government of some \$250,000,000 on family endowment represents one-eleventh of the 1946-47 Federal budget of \$2,769,350,000; and equals the total amount spent by all governments—municipal, provincial and Federal—on all health and welfare services in Canada in any pre-war year.<sup>26</sup>

#### APPRAISAL AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An analysis and evaluation of the family allowance scheme as operated in the Dominion of Canada presents some extreme difficulties. Comprehensive statistical data on economic developments are incomplete and, too often, unavailable. Isolation of the effects produced by family allowances from influences due to other factors in the reconversion period is a major problem.

However, it is possible to indicate and judge some of the positive and negative aspects of the plan. In the

<sup>24</sup> To demonstrate this trend, the number of families registered under the Act increased from 1,423,159 in 1946 to 1,609,086 by July, 1947. (*Windsor Daily Star*, July 26, 1947.)

<sup>25</sup> "Administration of Family Allowances in Canada," *The Labour Gazette*, XLVI, No. 1 (January, 1946), p. 17.

<sup>26</sup> *Toronto Evening Telegram*, February 1, 1947. Charlotte Whitton, "The Baby Bonus Priority Is Out of Line," *Saturday Night*, March 3, 1945.

positive category, there may be identified the enhancement of national income, the redistribution of national income to farm and other groups, the encouragement of natural population increase, a decrease in social costs, a defense against Communism, and the amelioration of the effects of labor-management difficulties. In the negative category, a large number of miscellaneous points present themselves, and for purposes of clarity may be grouped under the concepts of substantial and of invalid arguments.

In the change-over period from the economics of war to peacetime activity, many problems arose that Canada had in common with the rest of the world. Canceled war orders became the signal for the contraction and finally the extinction of war plants. While the cost of living rose ominously from 119.6 to 123.6, a high point in Canadian economic history, the index of employment dropped from 114.9 to 110.8. Family allowances amounting to approximately \$250,000,000 proved a bulwark against the rising cost of living by enhancing the national income at a critical time. Certainly "effective demand," in the purely Keynesian

sense of the term, was kept high and thus helped to smooth the transitional dislocation.<sup>27</sup>

The prosperity of Canada is dependent upon trade.<sup>28</sup> Although many plans have been devised by both private and public interests to enable export trade to operate at high peak levels, export trade, *per se*, has been ineffective in maintaining a reasonably high level of employment. The collapse of the British market only intensified the problem. The proponents of family allowances insist that the best way of maintaining full employment is to increase national income by the redistribution process of family allowances. In this way, purchasing power is sustained, employment and production is intensified by the multiplier effect of increasing the propensity to consume of those whose earnings are least. Certainly both the Beveridge and the Marsh Reports assert that social security measures are essential to high employment levels.

#### ENCOURAGEMENT OF NATURAL INCREASE OF POPULATION

In order to prevent the continued flow of Canadian skill and talent into the United States, family allow-

<sup>27</sup> "... effective demand is simply the aggregate income (or proceeds) which the entrepreneurs expect to receive, inclusive of the incomes which they will hand on to the other factors of production, from the amount of current employment which they decide to give." (John Maynard Keynes, *General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, p. 55.)

<sup>28</sup> F. A. Knox, "Some Aspects of Canada's Postwar Export Problem," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, X, August, 1944, p. 312.



ances were advocated in the decade of 1920-30. An implication inherent in the passage of *The Family Allowances Act, 1944*, was to stem the tide of immigration, although it must be recalled that in this regard the selective nature of American immigration policy is possibly the more adequate dyke.

The Government's long range sights were upon the net fertility rate in Canada, which has been falling perceptibly since World War I. Advocates of family allowance plans contend that, if allowances have any desirable demographic effect, it will be on the middle-class groups who hesitate to have children unless they can assure them a decent standard of living.<sup>29</sup> In a quantitative sense the family allowance program has had little, if any, effect upon the size of families. With the possible exception of a sudden jump in the birth rate between 1945 and 1946, there has been comparatively little fluctuation in Canada's national birth rate since the inception of the scheme.<sup>30</sup> In fact, fewer children were born in Canada last year despite the fact that there were more people in the country due to the encouragement of British immigration.

Perhaps the actual effect of the

family allowance program in Canada would be to improve the "quality" of the population rather than the quantity. Family allowances in Canada would seem to corroborate Pareto's dictum that wealth and income bear a direct relation to the net fertility rate in the short-run but that in the long-run, wealth and income bear an inverse relation to this rate.<sup>31</sup>

#### DECREASE IN SOCIAL COST

The Beveridge Report, later confirmed by Dr. Leonard C. Marsh, emphasized that, since a nation has to pay for disease, accident, sickness and other disabilities in lessened power of production and in idleness, it might better pay in advance at far less cost to prevent them.<sup>32</sup> It has been estimated that illness brings an annual loss in wages of some \$50,000,000 and in profits of \$75,000,000; the over-all cost to the Dominion of Canada being approximately \$300,000,000. The cost of family allowances annually amounts to about \$250,000,000, or the equivalent of two weeks' war expenditure.<sup>33</sup> Family allowances have been demonstrated to advance nutritional standards, and to reduce sickness and death. It would appear feasible that,

<sup>29</sup> Dorothy Stepler, *Family Allowances in Canada*, p. 31.

<sup>30</sup> *Toronto Globe and Mail*, August 3, 1949.

<sup>31</sup> J. J. Spengler, "Pareto On Population, I," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LVIII, No. 4, August, 1944, p. 583.

<sup>32</sup> William H. Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*, pp. 154-58.

<sup>33</sup> "Family Allowances," *Debates*, loc. cit., pp. 5328-338.



in order to prevent the aggregate loss of some \$100,000,000 to the Dominion from illness and deaths that could have been postponed, the yearly expenditure of \$250,000,000 in family allowances is a wise, long-range national investment.

#### SOME SUBSTANTIAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Although it is being increasingly recognized that family allowances appear to be on valid ground, their application in Canada has many imperfections. Many major valid arguments have been advanced against the scheme.

Because of the limitations of time and space imposed upon the writer we shall be forced to confine our discussion to the main economic arguments.

One of these arguments is that family allowances are an excessive national fiscal commitment.<sup>34</sup> Leading Canadian economists see no reason why the scheme cannot be financed without difficulty, *providing* that national income is maintained at high levels. There is a grave possibility that sustained demand in the United States and Europe for Canadian goods and services may drop sharply because of the currency crisis. Should this happen, continued deficit financing would be necessary. Family allowances, under deficit fi-

nancing, would involve doubling the sales tax, or a third more in income tax, or their equivalent in some other impost, or borrowing, adding more and more to the inverted pyramid of national debt.

A second apparently sound criticism of the family allowance plan in Canada is that it places an undue emphasis on *one* aspect of social security. If the scheme is "but the first installment" on a postwar social security program, its high annual cost of over \$250,000,000 may seriously prejudice the appropriation of adequate funds for other services such as health, public assistance, education and other badly needed services. Having committed itself to an outlay equal to one-third of the total Federal prewar national expenditure, the Government may be unwilling, even unable, to finance other social services. Certainly there was little evidence that a careful, painstaking, counting of the cost of all prospective social services was done.

In the pageantry that is called history most controversies which arise among men generate more heat than light. In Canada the array of gladiators who marshalled their talents and energies to battle the family allowance program was formidable, but, too often, their emotionalism far outweighed their reason. The major arguments of a frail nature directed

<sup>34</sup> Charlotte Whitton, *Dawn of Ampler Life*, pp. 72-94.

against the family allowance program in Canada were 1) the Act is unconstitutional, 2) allowances in kind are preferable, 3) a general increase in wages is a more comprehensive solution, 4) parental misuse of the allowances occur, 5) a major share of the benefits accrue to French-Catholic Quebec, 6) the scheme encourages higher birth rates among "undesirables," 7) there is too little precedent of an experience with family allowances.

A general increase in money wages does little to bolster real wages. Such a device would only result in the entrepreneur passing on the increase to the consumer in the form of higher prices, and in terms of real wages the persons with parental responsibilities would be little better off than before the general boost in money wages.

It is quite true that wealthy Ontario contributes much more in taxes to support the plan than its citizens draw from it in family allowance grants. Ontario's tax bill amounts to \$1,235,000,000 or 47 per cent of the total tax revenue; whereas her share of family allowance grants approximates \$75,000,000, or 29 per cent of the over-all allowances. Although Quebec receives \$84,000,000, or 33 per cent of the family allowance distribution, she pays into the Federal

public treasury \$905,000,000, or 34 per cent of the total tax revenue.

The scheme does represent a very considerable redistribution of national income, both from urban centers to rural districts and from Ontario to the less wealthy areas, notably the Prairie Provinces and the Maritime Provinces. About 6 per cent of the distribution of family allowances is made to British Columbia, which meets approximately the same proportion of the nation's tax bill.

### CONCLUSION

The fervent zeal for family allowances exhibited by Leon Lebel, Sir William Beveridge and Dr. Leonard Marsh has not been shared by many leading economists in the past. Alexander Gray in his brilliant and penetrating adverse criticism of family endowment termed the notion "the nationalization of wives and children."<sup>35</sup> Pigou was none the less critical of the privately endowed and administered family allowance plans with compensation funds because

it necessarily implies the taxing of bachelors in order to provide a bounty for men with large families—a sort of bounty to parenthood.<sup>36</sup>

It would be better, he concluded, if a nation must institute family endowment, to raise tax revenues for

<sup>35</sup> Alexander Gray, *Family Endowment: A Critical Analysis*, p. 78.

<sup>36</sup> A. C. Pigou, *The Economics of Welfare*, p. 605.

this purpose through general taxation.<sup>37</sup> A prominent study was made in the United States on social security in the early days of the Great Depression which gloomily concluded that family allowances did not seem "at present to find a place in a practical program of legal minimum wages."<sup>38</sup> The Canadian Family Allowance program and its early operation seem to refute the more lugubrious prophecies.

This is not to imply that the program cannot be improved. Amendments to expand the *Family Allowances Act, 1944*, might operate greatly to the advantage of individual Canadian residents. With the economic pressure exerted upon the parent by way of restrictive child labor laws, coupled with the need for advanced education in a very specialized mechanical age, family allowances could well be extended to cover children up to the age of 17 or 18, the average age of the high school graduate. Certainly precedents exist in other nations for such an extension of family allowance benefits.<sup>39</sup>

As part of his now famous report, Dr. Leonard Marsh computed a fam-

ily budget called the "Assistance Minimum" which estimated a \$14.63 monthly outlay for the maintenance of a child.<sup>40</sup> This would be a shade better than a subsistence standard of living. Marsh's family budget entitled "Desirable Living Minimum" determined the monthly maintenance of an average child at \$17.86. The average allowance now offered by the Act is \$5.95. The weight of evidence would seem to indicate that the rates of family allowances could be upgraded to an average of \$7.50, which is but 51 per cent of the "Assistance Minimum" budget proposed by Marsh. If the program was implemented to benefit low-income families, then, to avoid being in disparity with Marsh's endorsements, the upgrading of family allowance rates would appear to be in order.<sup>41</sup>

Nevertheless, our reasoning would be justly deemed rash if we did not consider the increase in rates in relation to cost and its effect upon the national economy. The avowed purpose of the Act was to *supplement* family income, and not to assume the entire burden of rearing the child.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> Barbara N. Armstrong, *Insuring the Essentials*, pp. 147-48.

<sup>39</sup> Paul H. Douglas, "Some Precedents for the Family Allowance System," *International Labour Review*, XI, No. 3, March, 1925, pp. 353-65.

<sup>40</sup> Stuart K. Jaffary, "Social Security—the Beveridge and Marsh Reports," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, IX, No. 4, November, 1943, p. 582.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 585.

# How Much Reform?

BY THE EDITORS

*Reprinted from WORK\**

**H**E'D just stepped out of the house to buy a newspaper. Along a dark stretch of the street, two men aimed shotguns at him, and fired seven blasts into his chest. He died almost immediately.

The victim was a Chicago ward committeeman named Charles Gross. Hoodlums had wanted him out of the way so that they could muscle in still further in Chicago politics.

But the murder misfired. After the news spread, a public protest rumbled throughout the Chicago area. Citizens from more than 100 civic organizations pledged an all-out campaign to break the tie-up between crime and politics.

According to the newspapers, the people are "aroused" over the widespread crime and immorality in public life. They're fed up.

At least so they say. But are they really?

Are the people fed up with the immoral movie ads that the newspapers run daily? These are the same papers that thunder against the immorality of public officials.

Are the people fed up with the shocking housing conditions that plague most big cities? They've done very little to see that public and private enterprise build more housing of the type that encourages decent family life.

Are the people fed up with the widespread refusal to rent apartments to families with children? Many landlords have the slogan: "No dogs or children wanted." This crime against children is perpetrated day in and day out.

Are the people fed up with the way countless men and women are turned down for jobs just because their skin color happens to be a shade or two darker than that of white people?

The sad fact is that they aren't fed up. Too many people who are shocked by gangsterism are loose and easy about other kinds of immorality.

Of course, we should sweep crooked officials out of office. We should stop "policy" and other gambling rackets that subsidize gangsters. This

\* 21 West Superior St., Chicago 10, Ill., March, 1952.

is necessary to help cure an ailing community. But we aren't going far enough if we stop there.

A man isn't well unless all parts of his body are in a healthy condition. If he is treated only for an abscessed tooth when he also has a bad cold, he may soon find himself in a hospital—with fine teeth but a body dying of pneumonia.

Good community life, too, comes from a *whole* view of moral health. A partial view of morality can be as deadly as a morality-be-damned attitude. Over-crowded housing conditions, polluted advertising and other pressing moral problems are as cancerous to Chicago as any gun-toting mobster.

Unless Chicago and other communities realize this, most of their public indignation will be nothing less than hot air.



### *From Secularism to Mythology*

I would only add that much less than on any of these can social unity be based on Blanshardism, or the common denominator of empirical cultural unity and conformity. This would be a unity based literally on nothing but the bare fact of history. This is the way things are and, if you want citizenship, you must conform. All disagreement is in bad taste and a threat to the safety of those who agree.

Unfortunately the situation becomes much more serious than this. Even the empirical cultures cannot repress the powerful religious drives of human nature and sooner or later they set to constructing quasi-religious myths around their little isles of safety. These myths are irrational and compulsive, and usually fraudulent; they often clothe the weakness and ugliness of their agreements under such titles as the right to happiness, freedom, passion, beauty, nationalism, love, free enterprise, American destiny, biological superiority.

I have the feeling that we do not yet sufficiently recognize, from the lights supplied us by modern knowledge of the psyche, that we have a profound hatred of laws given us by mere agreement, that we hide our hatred of this kind of minimal culture by the creation of these splendid myths. Freud was certainly right in proposing that the human spirit can be forced to construct religions. He was wrong in not seeing that it was the collapse of religion that had forced men to hide their hatred of society under the glory of constructed myths.—*William F. Lynch, S.J., in THOUGHT, Winter, 1951-2.*

# Religion in Life

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

*Text of the response to congratulatory addresses at the testimonial dinner commemorating Father LaFarge's 25 years on the editorial staff of AMERICA, New York, N. Y., February 25, 1952.*

**I** DO feel a very real, a very deep happiness this evening. From a purely personal point of view, no man can fail to be tremendously moved by so many totally unexpected expressions of affection and esteem. At the same time, he is terribly troubled and is conscious that mighty little of what is said really applies to him, but belongs to the friends and colleagues and religious superiors who have been his constant collaborators. For a religious journalist, if he is worth anything, is the result of cooperative effort, which he merely synthesizes in his own person.

Where I do find no difficulty in enjoying this event is the fact that it is a very real tribute to the ideas and principles which I have advocated in my 25 years of religious journalism.

None of this lifelong utterance would have been possible had I not enjoyed the unfailing support of the two organs with which I have been professionally identified: *America*, and its elder sister, *The Catholic Mind*, their editors, their staffs and their editorial assistants. I should like particularly to acknowledge the

debt which the Catholic interracial movement in this country owes to the fine collaboration of the religious press: the two major organs of the Archdiocese of New York and the Diocese of Brooklyn, which have featured the Catholic interracial program from the very beginning; the generous cooperation of Mr. Frank A. Hall and the N.C.W.C. News Service in Washington, and the Catholic press throughout the country as a whole, along with the brotherly cooperation of the Religious News Service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews here in New York City.

Incidentally, none of my work in this connection could have come to fruition without the continued support and counsel of my collaborators in the Catholic Laymen's Union and the Catholic Interracial Council, both of which Judge Stevens represents here tonight, and the practical genius of the Council's executive secretary, George K. Hunton.

With regard to my various activities, I have not always heard the nice things that were said about them here tonight. I was bluntly told at

one time that I was the friend of lost causes. Some might think this praise, but it was not meant as praise. It was felt all the more, because, like so many other criticisms you encounter along the road, it came from persons who were vastly better than myself. And I myself was convinced that a priest, in the short space of his life, has too many things to do for God and country to waste time on unworkable projects, however idealistic. But tonight's tribute witnesses to the fact that these were anything but lost causes.

To take one very specific instance out of many. At the time, some years ago, nothing seemed more hopeless and quixotic than the campaign upon which our Liturgical Arts Society embarked, with the idea of redeeming our American Catholic religious sculpture from the deplorable condition into which it had fallen: much of which was due to excessive commercialization. Yet the campaign proved fruitful, at least in a positive fashion. Today at last we seem to be finding a workable program for creating and marketing works of religious art that are suitable for our churches and institutions.

### TWO BASIC IDEAS

I don't think you would have made tonight's celebration possible if you did not agree with me on the two basic ideas on which my life's work turns. I am convinced in the first

place, that we can—and by God's grace—do, reach certainty on a large number of great truths about man and about human relations. Indeed, I share Dr. Finkelstein's view that a lot of truths about human conduct are more entitled to be called the study of an exact science than are the facts of nuclear physics.

I cannot understand how there can be any workable philosophy of human freedom, or of human brotherhood, or of world peace, or of social justice, if everything is merely relative to something else, if the only positive conclusion we can reach is that there are no positive conclusions, except those that we measure immediately and verify by our senses; if the stream of history creates all truth, and the only thing that doesn't change is change itself. I cannot picture to my mind a free society constructed by perpetual doubters. All that would emerge, as I see it, would be a world of double-talk and double-think, in the style of George Orwell's *1984*.

We gladly honor a man who does a lot of searching; but the most profound researcher I ever met, the late Pierre Lecomte du Noüy, came to the conviction at the end of his brilliant life that the goal of searching is to reach a knowledge that you can contemplate as finally known, verified and certain. The ideal of further quest for the sake of the quest is one of the most pitiful weaknesses

of the contemporary liberal mind.

Indeed, how could we have such a jolly celebration tonight if it were only to honor a mere search? We are registering here a conviction that after all we *have* arrived somewhere; that we *have* touched upon certain truths that no longer need to be "unthought"—truths that will be just as certain after November, 1952 as they were in the days of George Washington—or of Moses. And it is this conviction that we can eventually arrive somewhere that gives us the courage to continue searching. We celebrate, as Plato put it, "in festive companionship with the gods." But I must recall that by the "gods" Plato meant permanent realities, not mere visions of something that can never be attained.

The other hinge on which my life as a religious journalist has turned needs no elaborate explanation. It is indicated by my Roman collar and the letters placed before and after my name. I believe that some truths lie beyond the utmost limits of human investigation. I believe that God can speak to the world of men, that He can speak in time, in history. Through the exercise of my ordinary reason, I can verify the fact that God has thus spoken. I can determine to my own satisfaction by *whom* He has spoken, and *what* He has told man to do in order to attain the goal God has given him. And, because I am convinced that God is all good

and desires our ultimate happiness, this view is thoroughly satisfying and reassuring to me.

I fully realize that men differ greatly as to the nature of God's message to the human race and the path He has prescribed to the goal.

This means that there are differences of creed. But, at the same time, I strongly feel that we are all united on one fundamental point. We respect the man who has made up his mind on so important a business, and we are drawn even towards persons who reach conclusions different from our own wherever we observe that their conclusions are based upon sincere convictions.

#### GOD'S MESSAGE TO MAN

I think there is a steadily growing sentiment among thoughtful people in the United States, people of every shade of belief, that the time is gone when we could neglect the question of God's message to man. It is becoming no longer fashionable to laugh off the sincerely religious person as a zealot or an obscurantist.

It is no mere coincidence that the most monstrous enemies of freedom and civilization the world has ever seen are precisely those who rage in fury at the idea that God can speak to man or propose rules to regulate his conduct.

At a dinner given for me by some of my friends on my return from



Europe in October, 1938, I suggested that Hitler and Stalin, whatever differences those dictators might profess, were at one in their opposition to revealed religion. What I then said of both is still true of the survivor today.

In other words, I cannot see how we can plan effective psychological warfare against the Soviet Union unless we admit the possibility at least of a divinely revealed religion, and insist that one of the primary human freedoms is freedom to search for such a faith, and freedom to profess it when found.

At the same time I remain thoroughly hopeful. If I seem too optimistic, let me say that I have found that optimism, coupled with a direct approach to troublesome problems, always pays. I am convinced that the cause of civil rights will triumph in this country, and that much of the bitter opposition it still encounters is simply rearguard action, the last stand of a thoroughly discredited and a genuinely "lost cause."

### RELIGION AND CIVIL RIGHTS

I am convinced, too, that a growing number of intelligent leaders in this country are coming to recognize the importance of religion to civil rights. A ground for that hope I find in the attitude of organized American labor. From the very beginning the American Federation of Labor has stood out by virtue of its

opposition to irreligious totalitarianism, not just in theory, but in practice, as the example and language of our guest, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, has proved to us this evening. The cause which he so nobly represents was lifted out of the lost-cause category and made a triumphant front action in behalf of human liberty precisely because he took time to think things through and see that without reason and without God no effective defense of human rights is possible on this earth.

In this stand he is paralleled by his brothers of the C.I.O., who have warred relentlessly against discrimination in their ranks. They are clinching this policy by the project for better community relations recently undertaken by the United Steel Workers of America.

Since I have spoken of differences in belief, let me here emphasize one more point before I close—something upon which I feel very deeply. I cannot agree with those persons who vociferously assert that sincere religious belief, from its very nature, is a divisive factor in the community.

To let such a poisonous notion gain a foothold in American life would, as I see it, destroy the very unity and peace we seek and cherish in our communities. Mere subjective religious emotionalism might well divide us into quarreling factions. But a religious faith that prizes the full dignity of human reason as a

path toward discovering the holy will of God is the surest and only guarantee of peace and unity in our city, our country and our world.

If religious divisions are to be healed by outlawing religion itself and creating a nation of doubters, every man will be divided from his brother and the path laid open for the master mind of the ideologist to take charge. On the other hand, I know no surer pledge of a unified community than the company of men and women who apply the teachings of religion to the problems of daily life as consistently, as intelligently, yes, as scientifically, as they can.

I see in this gathering another proof that all persons of good will in our communities can unite to preserve our American heritage of rea-

son and reverence and respect for religious faith. That is a source of strong hope and consolation.

The hour is late, and I have already prolonged our celebration unduly. I shall prolong it in my heart each day as I stand at the altar and celebrate the companionship of souls with the Saviour whom I acknowledge and worship as God, and before whose Mother I bow in loving reverence. I shall take in my hands the beautiful golden chalice which you so generously presented to me, and will offer great thanks to the Master for the gift of so wonderful an evening. I shall beg Him to repay in His own matchless way all here present and all who have contributed to my happiness. May we all meet again in the eternal celebration that is to come.



### ***Unity in the Social Field***

All too many of us are still blinded by prejudice to the truth contained in the social teaching of the Church. We are not united in our allegiance to that teaching; our knowledge of it is confused; in its following we are divided. Thus we lack unity amongst ourselves and with it the power to take to our countrymen the truth that would unite them and in whose following they would find social and industrial peace. Our voice in this field is uncertain, our message confused. It will remain so until we take the truth for our guide. We have done that always in the case of our Catholic schools. In their defense we speak with one voice and that is why our claims are heeded. We have but to do the same in the field of social reform for a like result to be obtained, bringing with it inestimable benefits to ourselves and our countrymen. And our duty in this matter cannot lightly be tossed aside. For how much longer, then, must it remain unheeded? The answer to that question is in each man's heart.—*Paul Crane, S.J., in the CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT, December, 1951.*

# Observations on Recent American Historiography

WILLIAM L. LUCEY, S.J.

*Reprinted from THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN\**

THE presidential addresses of the American Historical Association, delivered at the annual convention and printed in the January issue of the *Review*, are a fairly sound clue to the temper of American historians and the tenor of American historiography. The office of president is usually bestowed on a member of the Association who is recognized as an outstanding historian by his colleagues, even though they had little say in the selection and would quite probably prefer another. Not all outstanding American historians are honored with the office, but those who are so honored have a solid claim to prominence in the field of history. The president is usually a historian with many years of experience in the classroom, has a number of publications to his credit, has reached, or is approaching, the status of professor emeritus, and quite likely will soon have a volume of essays written by his former students and dedicated to his retirement. He is in a position to speak much more freely than an assistant professor seeking tenure.

The office, the occasion and tradi-

tion have combined to make the presidential address a serious, scholarly and frequently candid discussion on the needs and deficiencies of historical writing, on the nature of history and the function of the historians, on the importance of an interpretation of history and the errors of some schools of interpretation and of some historians. Strictures on any particular historian are, however, usually postmortem in the literal sense. Historians know the advantages of diplomacy.

This paper is an examination of the six presidential addresses given since the defeat of Hitler and the emergence of the cold war between Communist totalitarianism and the free nations of the West. The objective of the examination is simple enough. Each president, we may safely assume, gave serious thought to the selection of a topic for his address; the topic finally selected was of deep concern to him and one with which he hoped his colleagues were or would be concerned. On this assumption the presidential addresses warrant the attention of all who are devoted to the study of history and the work of edu-

\* Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Mo., November, 1951.

cation, and it is natural enough to inquire what were the seasoned views of these high-ranking historians. Were they satisfied with what was being done by their guild and the methods of doing it? Did they take the occasion to warn their colleagues of harmful trends?

#### SALIENT IDEAS

Since the addresses are available for all in the *Review* and many have read them, a brief statement of the salient ideas of each will suffice here. Those who have read them will remember, and those who make much of geographical influences will like to be reminded, that all six addresses were given by historians connected with large eastern universities: Columbia, Harvard, Yale, Princeton and the University of Pennsylvania.

The influence of the frontier hypothesis on American historiography was the concern of both Carlton J. H. Hayes and Thomas J. Wertenbaker.<sup>1</sup> There was no denying, of course, the importance of the frontier in American history; it had, however, been accepted hastily and without careful scrutiny as the key to American history, and it had been overemphasized. It was one of the factors in the making of American institutions, but not the only one; it was one of many,

and not the most important one. Our language, religion, ideals of liberty, political institutions, social customs, architecture, crafts, agricultural methods—our civilization—were and are a heritage from Europe, in particular, the heritage of the civilization of the Atlantic community. The transit of culture was to the frontier, not from the frontier.

Hayes pointed out how this exclusive concern with the frontier as the key to American history had resulted in a neglect of European history in the professional training of American historians and in the growth of intellectual isolationism, and had ill prepared this nation to defend the civilization on which it had mentally turned its back. Wertenbaker was more concerned with the transit of the civilizations of the original colonies and eastern States, planted by the forces of inheritance, continual contact with the original source, local conditions and the melting plot, to the West. The pattern for the molding of the West will be found on the Atlantic seaboard. Yet this same exclusive concern with the frontier has so ignored the transplanting of the eastern civilization to the West that it has become "one of the most neglected" fields in American historiography.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Carlton J. H. Hayes, "The American Frontier—Frontier of What?," *American Historical Review*, LI (January, 1946), pp. 199-216; Thomas J. Wertenbaker, "The Molding of the Middle West," *ibid.*, LIII (January, 1948), pp. 223-234.

<sup>2</sup> Wertenbaker, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

Sidney B. Fay appraised the once popular idea of progress in the light of events since 1900. The idea that progress was constant, automatic and inevitable in accordance with cosmic laws had had a firm grip on American minds, prominent historians included, during the second half of the nineteenth century; so firm was the hold, the idea of progress was "assumed as the animating and controlling force in our western civilization."<sup>3</sup> Such was the impact of social Darwinism on America.

By chance or design Fay passed judgment on the idea of progress just a half century after John Bach McMaster, one of the major historians of his day, had measured the progress in America since 1800. He wrote the article, "A Century of Social Betterment," for the *Atlantic Monthly*.<sup>4</sup> What he said was quite true, but the tone of the article was panegyric on the Machine that had, while lightening the burdens of man, increased man's capacity for bodily comfort. It was written with the optimism so characteristic of those years.

Not many were surprised at or demurred to Fay's statement that the events since the turn of the century had struck a crushing blow to this idea. It was, in the first place, "logically

ally meaningless," and such ideas make very poor assumptions. It seems to me that the real contribution of this address is inferential. Fay traced the origin and growth of the idea of progress, and one can see that the idea took root in the sixteenth century and developed *pari passu* with the rejection of the supernatural, the repudiation of Divine Providence, the weakening of Christianity, the acceptance of man's perfectibility on this earth, a growing confusion about the real nature of man, the apotheosis of man's autonomy, and the rapid strides in the physical sciences. The idea, then, filled a mental vacuum created by the retreat from Christianity.

Two years after this autopsy on the idea of progress Kenneth Scott Latourette invited his colleagues to consider one of the oldest interpretations of history: the Christian interpretation. "History cannot be written," he reminded them, "without some basis of selection, whether artificial and purely subjective or inherent in man's history."<sup>5</sup> It is a rare and pleasant sight to see the pages of the *American Historical Review* with footnote references to the Old and New Testaments, to the four Gospels and the Acts, and to St. Paul's Letters to the Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians and Colos-

<sup>3</sup> "The Idea of Progress," *American Historical Review*, LII (January, 1947), p. 232. The emphasis has been added.

<sup>4</sup> LXXIX (January, 1897), pp. 20-27.

<sup>5</sup> "The Christian Understanding of History," *American Historical Review*, LIV (January, 1949), p. 261.

sians—twenty-five references in all. And it is a revealing insight into the controlling attitudes of many American historians that Professor Latour-ette did not feel he could assume that his audience had a sufficient understanding of the basic idea of the Christian interpretation of history. He had to explain it to them. No president of the association ever had to explain to the members any of the deterministic interpretations of history, be it racial, geographical, economic or any other kind that belittled or denied the part of man in history. But in the year 1948 A.D. the Christian interpretation of history, the interpretation that recognizes that "the individual is of outstanding importance,"<sup>6</sup> had to be unfolded, expounded and annotated for the benefit of American historians. Historians of the main currents of American thought should take note of this address.

### SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The social responsibility of the historians was the theme of Conyers Read's address. He found that the teaching of history on the undergraduate level had been neglected in favor of the few who aspired to graduate work and in favor of publications. Historians must pay more attention

to their responsibility of interpreting the past to the present generation, and to do this they could no longer assume, as they once did, an air of neutrality towards the main issues of life. History must be taught with reference to living, with the historian first recognizing certain fundamental values as beyond dispute. Hence, he thought that "the first prerequisite of a historian is a sound social philosophy."<sup>7</sup>

It is clear from the address that Read was disturbed by the threat to our survival from Hitler, Mussolini, and now Stalin. It appears rather obvious, too, that the address raised and left unanswered many questions. What "values" are fundamental and beyond dispute? Why an act of faith "in the validity of our democratic assumptions?" What kind of history results when one admits that the historian "selects and arranges and emphasizes his factual data with reference to some pattern in his mind, some concept of what is socially desirable, and he follows the evolution of society with constant reference to that objective?"<sup>8</sup>

Fortunately, and it could well be designedly, Samuel E. Morison answered some of these questions. Clearly, convincingly and repeatedly he reminded the members of the As-

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268.

<sup>7</sup> "The Social Responsibilities of the Historians," *American Historical Review*, LV (January, 1950), p. 285.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 285.

sociation what their primary responsibility as historians was. Their task was "to illuminate the past for their hearers or readers," and to present "a corpus of ascertained fact." The fundamental question before the historian as he explores past actuality was: "What actually happened, and why."<sup>9</sup> Morison admitted that in presenting a corpus of ascertained facts there must be selection, emphasis and arrangement of facts, and he recognized that the historian's philosophy of history influenced the selection, the emphasis and the arrangement of facts. But he severely chided those who, repudiating the primary responsibility of the historian, professed that it was neither possible nor desirable to describe the past as it actually happened, and asserted that the historian's primary function was so to select and arrange the facts of the past as to direct the present and the future towards what the historian considers highly desirable goals.

As an example he used the methods, the frame of reference and the writings of Charles A. Beard, a former president of the Association. Morison admitted he was skating on thin ice in so addressing the guild. It was time that someone took the risk. His parting advice was also a departure; he suggested that his colleagues seek divine guidance in their work and

recommended a few verses from St. Paul and Aquinas' prayer for scholars.

### STRESSES SOME FEATURES

The historian will find food for thought in these six presidential addresses, and he will find fault with some of the remarks. I would like to stress some of the features that appealed to me.

It is encouraging to find the qualifications and the primary task of historians so clearly and emphatically stated. No person "can be a great or even a good historian" without "an inherent loyalty to truth, a sense of balance and a high degree of intellectual honesty." And his basic task: "one of presenting a corpus of ascertained fact."<sup>10</sup> This plain but by no means simple task has been obscured, as Morison observes, by an overstress in recent years on the limitations of scientific objectivity, by an education that has implied that the historian's problem is a description of trends and a comparison of points of view, and by a claim that the historian's vocation is to influence the future by directing the present trend of events. Influencing the future is, at best, secondary and derivative. His main function, to repeat Morison again, is to describe events simply as they happened, and then to understand the

<sup>9</sup> "Faith of a Historian," *American Historical Review*, LVI (January, 1951), pp 263, 264.

<sup>10</sup> Morison, *op. cit.*, pp. 262, 263.



motives and objects of the persons involved, individually and collectively, as impartially as he is able.<sup>11</sup>

### HISTORIAN'S TASK

This vocation of the historian was stated in similar words by another able historian at about the same time. The proper task of the historian, wrote Ross J. S. Hoffman, is

to probe into and verify by every possible means the experience of mankind so that by seeing themselves in one dimension more men may gain a better understanding of what kind of creatures God fashioned them to be. History is not a 'march of time' panorama of progress from the amoeba to the world state; the generations of men are not enslaved in the service of some emergent ultimate pattern for the life of a race.<sup>12</sup>

Next, is the preoccupation of these prominent historians with the need and the influence of a philosophy of history. One of the addresses, as has been noted, was entirely devoted to the exposition of the Christian understanding of history; others bore witness to the influence of a philosophy on what the historian said and wrote.

"History cannot be written," observed Professor Latourette, "without some basis of selection, whether

artificial or purely subjective or inherent in man's story."<sup>13</sup> After enumerating a variety of "purposes which have governed" historians at various times in the selection of significant facts, he posed the inevitable dilemma:

On the one hand he is painfully aware of the many interpretations and philosophies of history which have been put forward and is therefore hesitant to accept wholeheartedly any one of them. On the other hand he is confronted with the necessity of acting on some principle of selection, even though it be arbitrary, and is haunted by the persistent hope that a framework and meaning can be found which possess objective reality.<sup>14</sup>

Conyers Read also asserted that historical writings cannot escape the influence of the historian's philosophy of man. The difficulties begin to appear

when as historians we attempt the synthesis; and, contrary to widespread opinion, this is an act which most of us habitually perform not in books but in classrooms, from the primary grades to postgraduate courses. There by selection, arrangement and particularly by emphasis we impose the pattern. It is idle to deny that the pattern we impose is profoundly influenced not only by our personal idiosyncrasies but by the whole climate of opinion in which we live. . . . It makes a lot of difference whether the historian approaches the

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.

<sup>12</sup> In a book review of *Christianity and History* by Herbert Butterfield (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1950), in the *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXVI (January, 1951), p. 450.

<sup>13</sup> Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 261.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*



past as a Christian zealot or as a skeptic, or as a good Whig or as a good Socialist. . . .

Are we, for example, mere implementations of biological urges destined to no more significant end than the banquet chamber of the earthworms, or are we divinely created in accordance with a divine purpose and containing within ourselves the potentialities of eternal life? Our answer to this question will have a profound influence upon our personal and social behavior. At this point history impinges very definitely upon the basic problems of modern society.<sup>15</sup>

Morison, too, makes it clear that the historian's sense of values influences the selection and arrangement of facts. It goes without saying, he told his audience, that

complete, "scientific" objectivity is unattainable by the historian. His "choice of facts to be recorded, his distribution of emphasis among them, his sense of their significance and relative proportion, must be governed by his philosophy of life."<sup>16</sup>

It is quite obvious that there is agreement here on the importance of a philosophy of history; one would like to think that there was a growing recognition that a false philosophy produces false history. At least, one can find in these addresses a repudiation of or a warning against some of the once popular philosophies and assumptions of American historians.

However, recognition of the importance of a philosophy of history is only the preface to the problem. The historian is no more free to embrace any kind of philosophy than is a geographer free to assume that the earth is of this or that shape. He is not free to flip a coin to decide whether men are "mere implementations of biological urges" or "divinely created in accordance with a divine purpose." His responsibility is to know what man is before he investigates the past activities of man. And this brings us to the major weakness of American historians and historiography: a hasty and uncritical acceptance of a variety of philosophies. One generation embraces the racial interpretation of history; the next generation abandons it to embrace the frontier interpretation; the third generation discards the frontier theory in favor of the economic interpretation.

#### UNDERSTANDING MAN

The historian's philosophy of history is his understanding of man: his origin, his nature, his innate capacities, his freedom and necessities, his destiny. This understanding is not derived from a study of the past, for the historian is not equipped with the tools to probe the ultimates. "Philosophy must be brought to his-

<sup>15</sup> Read, *op. cit.*, pp. 280, 281.

<sup>16</sup> Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 263, quoting F. M. Cornford, *The Unwritten Philosophy and Other Essays*, p. 1.

tory, it cannot be extracted from it."<sup>17</sup> The study of man in the past may and should illuminate and illustrate the historian's philosophy, but his understanding of man must be derived from the sciences that study man, and not, as so frequently happens, from the physical sciences. The nature of atoms does not explain the nature of man. A sound philosophy of history is derived, then, from theology, psychology, logic, ethics, cosmology, sciences that study the nature, faculties, activities, and habitat of man. The historian, as an intelligent and intellectually honest student, must master these sciences.

### PRACTICAL TEST

What, then, is a practical test of any sound philosophy of history? It must be one that does not distort the past and your knowledge of the past; one that does not control and determine your selection, arrangement and emphasis of factual data so that the past fits a pattern; one that does not interfere with and frustrate the primary function of the historian, i. e., presents a corpus of ascertained facts; one that does not put a question mark after your intellectual honesty. Granting the personal element in interpretation and the influence of

philosophy on the synthesis, it is a travesty to say, as one has said, "that every historian abandons objectivity as soon as he selects facts for presentation."<sup>18</sup>

This simple test should compel many historians to re-examine their assumptions and the philosophies that dictate the assumptions. Take, for instance, the historians, and there are many, who assume the absolute uniformity of nature. This assumption obliges them to deny the possibility of miracles, to ignore the supernatural and to shun the Christian interpretation of history. But it also compels them to deny *a priori* some historical facts—any historical fact, proven like other historical facts, when and if it is contrary to the uniformity of nature.

A fair statement of this assumption will be found in a review of *A Guide to Historical Method*, a work of the late Gilbert J. Garraghan, which explains and maintains the Christian philosophy of history. The reviewer, however, took exception to this philosophy and contended that:

Most historians will probably continue to be content with the "rationalistic" method, assuming, like the natural scientist, the uniformity of nature and accepting the limitations of the assumption. The method is agnostic only

<sup>17</sup> G. M. Trevelyn, "Stray Thoughts on History," in *An Autobiography and Other Essays* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949), p. 82.

<sup>18</sup> Ralph Ray Fahrney, "Edward Channing," in *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography*, ed. by Wm. T. Hutchinson (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 302.

in that it employs a philosophy, or hypothesis, consistent with this assumption. The assumption does not imply the rejection of theism as a matter of personal faith, but only that historians are not provided with tools adequate for dealing with ultimates.<sup>19</sup>

Note what is freely admitted in this statement. The philosophy of history is dictated by and made consistent with an assumption. The historian is absolved from dealing with ultimates because he has no adequate tools, but the assumption is borrowed from the natural scientists, who have no adequate tools either. The historian can profess theism and the full implications of theism in his private life, but must discard it when he is writing history; he must lead a double intellectual life. When the historian is faced with a historical fact which is not in conformity with the physical laws of nature, he must deny the fact, he must question the tools of a historian, tools that are adequate to establish historical facts. He must never question his assumption. He must be ready to deny *a priori* some kinds of historical facts.

It is rather difficult to see what is rational about accepting assumptions that compel historians to ignore ultimates and so to deny *a priori* some historical facts. Why should historians be willing to admit the superna-

tural as a factor in their personal lives but be so determined to deny it as a factor in the history of man? I think Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, gave the answer in his baccalaureate address to the graduating class of Princeton last June. He told them: "The basic cause of man's anxiety today stems from a conflict between man's need for the supernatural and his stubborn unwillingness to accept it."<sup>20</sup> Historians share a responsibility for this anxiety.

Now let us look at one of the questions raised by Conyers Read. Few will deny that a historian should have a "sound social philosophy." Indeed, not only his social but his whole philosophy of life should be sound. But should this social philosophy control and determine the selection of factual data? Read concedes that it will and that it should:

Actually the historian finds in the past what he looks for in the past. He selects and arranges and emphasizes his factual data with reference to some pattern in his mind, some concept of what is socially desirable, and he follows the evolution of society with constant reference to that objective. Growth becomes for him movement toward it; decay, movement away from it. And of course, by implication, the curve which he plots for the past inevitably projects itself into the future.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Homer C. Hockett, *American Historical Review*, LII (July, 1947), p. 764.

<sup>20</sup> *The New York Times*, June 11, 1951, p. 19.

<sup>21</sup> Read, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

If I have read Morison correctly, that is just what he is condemning Beard for doing, and rightly so. When the historian makes the past fit a pattern, he has abandoned his primary function and has turned his back on his first responsibility. Beard thought he had a sound social philosophy and he considered it his responsibility so to select and arrange the facts of history as to influence the present and the future in the direction he considered socially desirable. The desired direction was a collectivist democracy. And Morison expressed the wish that every young historian would read Beard's final book "as an example of what happens when a historian consciously writes to shape the future instead of to illuminate the past; of a man becoming the victim or the prisoner of his 'frame of reference'."<sup>22</sup> It would seem that Morison's criticism of Beard also holds for Read. Sound social philosophy or not, Read's methods will produce false history.

#### CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION

There are many other seasoned estimates and observations in these presidential addresses that should be underscored. Perhaps they will be helpful to the younger historians; one gets the impression that they were

directed at them. For these younger people should be interested in the transit of the eastern civilizations to the West, a field neglected because of the over-emphasis on the frontier as the factor in the moulding of the West. Indirectly at least, they have been asked to examine more closely their assumptions, for most of the addresses have examined one or the other of the "assumptions" accepted by our predecessors and they have been found wanting. They could well afford to examine more closely the Christian interpretation of history, as Professor Latourette invited them to do. It provides the historian "with an absolute criterion" of values, it acknowledges the freedom of man's will in the making of history, and it recognizes the "outstanding importance" of the individual in society.<sup>23</sup>

In his baccalaureate address to the Yale graduating class this past June Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale, urged the seniors to reject the prevailing philosophy that the individual had little control over his future.<sup>24</sup> As a historian Dr. Griswold knows that, ever since Herbert B. Adams and John W. Burgess inaugurated graduate studies in history and political science at Johns Hopkins and Columbia, the prevailing philosophy behind American historio-

<sup>22</sup> Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

<sup>23</sup> Latourette, *op. cit.*, pp. 268, 270, 275.

<sup>24</sup> *The New York Times*, June 11, 1951, p. 19.

graphy has conceded to the individual little control over the future. The trend has been away from the Christian understanding of history and toward a deterministic philosophy, racial, geographical, economic, or a combination of them, each of which denied or belittled the part man played in history and made him a robot or an automaton.<sup>25</sup> In as many words, Dr. Griswold was asking

the historians as well as the seniors of Yale to reject philosophies that belittle the individual.

On the same day the presidents of two large eastern universities told their graduating classes to face up to the fact of man's need for the supernatural and to hold fast to a philosophy that respected the individual and the individual's control of the future. It is timely advice for historians, too.

<sup>25</sup> See writer's article, "The Philosophy of History of American Historians," *The Historical Bulletin*, XXVII (March, 1949), p. 51, sq.



### *The World's Need Today*

What is the world's chief need today? The Communists and the materialists and all those who, with Herbert Spencer and Professor Bernal, believe that Science is the panacea for all our ills, and the supreme good of mankind, have a glib and obvious answer. Since the Industrial Revolution in the modern world a hundred years ago, they say, human life has been revolutionized and human welfare has been immensely augmented by the triumphs of applied science. Hence our most urgent requirement is that these advances should go further and faster, and that hunger, cold, heat, disease and distance should progressively be overcome. Food, clothing and housing are the fundamental needs of man; and there is no reason why, with the help of science, these should not be made available for everyone.

But this is to simplify matters to the point of absurdity. It is a gratuitous assumption that man's fundamental needs are merely material and limited to food, clothing and housing. His needs after these material ones have been provided for are no less fundamental. Men's mental, esthetic, moral, spiritual needs are the characteristically *human* needs, and therefore more fundamental than the material needs men have in common with brute animals. Man's desire for freedom, for ownership, for power, for honor, for fellowship, for love, is greater and more fundamental than his material desire for food and drink and shelter.—Prof. V. M. Sammanasu, M.A., in *THE KING'S RALLY*, January, 1952.

# The Parish and the Community

PATRICK J. MULLANEY

*Reprinted from INTERRACIAL REVIEW\**

**I**F, as an essayist has said, every building is a book, an epic of Christianity and democracy in action is being written in the Harlem parish of St. Charles Borromeo. The million-dollar parochial school and community center for all people, soon to be erected in this underprivileged neighborhood, is at once an adventure in faith, a drama of hope and a poem of love. More than that, it is a practical textbook of progressive parochial planning.

St. Charles' is an all-Negro parish. Its congregation, numbering about 2,000, are predominantly laboring people. Like their non-Catholic neighbors, they are victims of generations of deprivations; deprivations of constitutional rights; deprivations of material and spiritual opportunities. Herded by social segregation and economic discrimination into a crowded ghetto, they wage a constant battle against disease, crime and despair. They are determined that their children shall know a brighter future, built upon the solid foundation of a religious education.

Around the turn of the century, when the present Church of St.

Charles was opened on West 141st Street, the old church on 142nd Street was converted into a school. Through the years this antiquated makeshift has provided the young citizenry of the parish with an excellent, modern education. Last year, St. Charles' children attained an average of over 90 per cent in the New York State Regents examination, an enviable record for any primary school, but not an unusual one for St. Charles'. The parish school did not reopen this fall. Its ancient timbers had been declared unsound. But the desire for Catholic education is not easily quenched at St. Charles'—while a new school is a planning and abuilding, each school day will see the entire student body going by bus to St. Joseph's School on West 127th Street.

Under the guidance of their pastor, Msgr. Cornelius J. Drew, the people of St. Charles' have imbibed many advanced ideas of the role of the Catholic parish in the community. Their neighborhood has long felt the need of a community center where its young people might gather under a wholesome guidance, and grown-

\* 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y., December, 1951.

ups might meet to plan civic improvements, conduct adult education classes, or play a friendly game of checkers. Msgr. Drew's resolve to incorporate such a center into plans for the new school has the enthusiastic support of his parishioners as well as the endorsement and assistance of diocesan authorities. His decision created a flood of good feeling from non-Catholic Harlemites who have seen the success of St. Charles' non-sectarian sports program in keeping their young people off the streets and away from the cellar clubs.

#### DYNAMIC CATHOLICITY

A talk with Monsignor Drew is the key to a better understanding of the dynamic Catholicity of his parishioners. "Many people tell us that it would be a modern miracle to succeed in this ambitious project," he tells you. "Some even go so far as to say we're crazy. Well, we're going to prove how sane we are. We have faith in God, faith in our cause, faith in ourselves and faith in our friends," he continues, tapping your knee paternally to emphasize each point. "The generosity and energy of our parishioners and non-Catholic neighbors belie the slanders you hear about lazy and irresponsible Negroes. The help we expect from other quarters will be a good measure of the interest of white Catholics in the spiritual and temporal welfare of their Negro brothers in Christ."

The interracial aspects of the St. Charles project have aroused interest in it far beyond the parish borders. This interest stems partly from Monsignor Drew's conspicuous successes in creating understanding between white and Negro people. His method is a simple one. "Don't try to make Negroes white or whites Negro," he warns. "Give both the opportunity to meet on terms of equality and you'll find that friendship, respect and understanding are inevitable." Before coming to St. Charles', as a pastor in parishes with mixed congregations he proved to skeptical white parishioners that Negroes make excellent neighbors. His experience has convinced him that the disease of racial prejudice is neither incurable nor inborn. "When Negro and white children sit side-by-side in school and kneel side-by-side at the altar, nobody on earth can tell them any lies about racial superiorities."

Do Negroes make good Catholics? The Monsignor eyed his questioner with patient understanding. He has heard this query innumerable times, and knows how often it is the sum of the inquirer's misunderstanding and misinformation. He knows, too, that underlying it is an unspoken question: do Negroes make good? With a candor which is the heritage of his Irish ancestry, he answers both questions. "There was a day when I wasn't sure myself, but now

I know that they are the material from which saints are made, and that given the chance, which is their due, they are a match for any race." He will tell you frankly that, as pastor of the interracial parish of St. Augustine in the Bronx, he found Negro and white children on a par in school, while the Negroes surpassed the whites in religious fervor.

There are close to 300 conversions annually at St. Charles', but the pastor eschews any praise of this accomplishment with the grave reminder that Harlem is still 97 per cent non-Catholic. Converts are instructed in classes which meet twice weekly for four months before they are received into the Church. To the suggestion that this seems a rather rigorous schedule, Monsignor Drew replies crisply but with evident gratification: "These folks have chosen the 'hard' religion and they're willing to work hard to attain it. When they complete the course, they understand their religion, they practice it, they spread it, and they persevere in it."

#### BREACHING THE WALL OF RACE PREJUDICE

Looking toward the day when the walls of race prejudice shall have been breached and Negroes will be free to bring up their children in an environment of their own choosing, Monsignor Drew has a word about the so-called white parishes.

The day will come—and it must come—when the young people we are training here will play their parts in the life of other parishes throughout America. They will be fully equal to it, a credit to their Catholic upbringing. I have no doubt that within five years Negro families will be living in every Catholic parish here in New York. Soon most parishes will have a few Negro parishioners.

Three reasons, all of recent origin, assure the end of segregation of Negro homeowners and tenants into the Negro ghetto, Monsignor Drew declares:

Thousands of Negroes are gainfully employed, receiving salaries far beyond what they could have expected ten years ago. As a result, they are financially able to buy or rent homes outside Harlem. Secondly, the Supreme Court has held that restrictive covenants can no longer be enforced in our courts. New York City has a number of public housing projects built or projected in every borough. Remember that all these projects have mixed occupants and we have the third reason why Negro families will be found in many previously white neighborhoods.

The conditions under which the majority of Negro Americans are forced to live are a sin against justice, Monsignor Drew declares, and he considers it his duty as a pastor of a Negro congregation to fight not only the sin itself, but its roots also, wherever they may be found. This he does at every opportunity, preaching the gospel of racial justice far beyond his parish. A logical and persuasive speaker, with an intimate



understanding of the complexities of interracial problems, he attacks apathy with equal vigor and equal success.

The pastor of St. Charles' is no armchair theorist, planning a golden age of the future while comfortably insensible to the needs of his own generation. He is a doer of the word, intensely interested in neighborhood welfare and acutely conscious of the importance of the Catholic parish in the community. "Like any other local organization, the parish that shows an interest in the community will gain its good will," he tells his parishioners, admonishing them that they have both the right and the duty to be represented in local civic enterprises. He urges upon them the necessity of bringing the force of Christian principles to bear in an area where criminals and Communists continually seek to assert undesirable leadership to profit from poverty. Setting an example for his flock, he is an active participant in movements which seek to benefit his community from within and without.

#### NEIGHBORLY COOPERATION

The enlightened social attitude of the pastor and people of St. Charles Borromeo's is reflected in a spirit of understanding and cooperation among their neighbors. Shortly after plans were announced for the school

and community center, a non-Catholic Harlem businessman contributed a thousand dollars, because, as he said, he had witnessed the wonders that Catholic education was doing for children of his race. Many prominent non-Catholic Negroes, among them Dr. Channing H. Tobias of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Jackie Robinson of the Brooklyn Dodgers, as well as white Protestants and Jews, have numbered themselves among the supporters of the unique project. Encouraging recognition of the religious and social significance of this pilot project, which Father John LaFarge of *America* has called a "landmark in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States and an example to parishes throughout the country," is being manifested by Catholics, far and near.

Every building is the embodiment of the ideas of its builders. The basic ideas behind the St. Charles parish project are the inseparable virtues of love of God and love of neighbor. The visitor comes away from St. Charles' humbly conscious of the fact that he has witnessed a revelation of Christian love. As he ponders deeply, "Who is my neighbor?" he knows that here is a glorious opportunity for every race to prove themselves good Samaritans.

## **Editorials**

### ***Unconscious Promoter of Brotherhood***

**M**RS. AGNES E. MEYER, a rich and influential matron of Washington, D. C., has an angry article in the March issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

Mrs. Meyer is angry at the Protestant clergy (and the Catholic clergy, too, as far as that goes). She says it was the Protestants who first "breached the wall of separation" between Church and State in this country by inaugurating "released time" programs whereby public school children may get a weekly hour of instruction in the religion of their parents' choice.

That's interesting. We sat through an entire lecture by Paul Blanshard in the First Christian Church in Cedar Rapids and he never told us that it was the Protestants who started the breach in that mythical but well-beloved wall of separation. To hear Mr. Blanshard talk it was only Catholics who indulged in such skull-duggery.

In the eyes of Mrs. Meyer, however, Catholics and the great majority of Protestants are partners in crime. She is particularly horrified because the last convention of the

American Council of (Protestant) Churches unanimously voted to defend released time instruction programs even before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Of course, neither Protestants nor Catholics, by engaging in the activities that pain Mrs. Meyer, are trying to attack separation of Church and State. They are simply trying to provide religious instruction for the young. Many children, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish, receive such instruction in their privately supported parochial school. Children in the public schools are entitled to time off from their other studies so that they can be taught what will prove to be the most important lessons of their lives.

This is not the first article by Mrs. Meyer to appear in the *Atlantic Monthly*. In the November, 1948 issue she had a defense of secularism. "The unifying mission of secularism has a sanctity all its own," wrote Mrs. Meyer resolutely, if incoherently. We looked up secularism in Webster's *New-International Dictionary* and found this definition: "Any view of life, education, etc., or any policy or program referring to such, based on the premise that religion and religious considerations, as of

God and a future life, should be ignored or excluded." That's the view of life that Agnes Meyer would like to impose on young Americans.

Mrs. Meyer's article, however, may have unplanned but beneficial consequences. Less devious than Mr. Blanshard, she has pointed out that Catholics and Protestants have a great deal in common. By clearly stating the secularist position and by her attack on the majority of Protestant leaders, she may do more to promote Protestant and Catholic co-operation than a whole library of Brotherhood Week speeches. — THE WITNESS, DUBUQUE, IOWA, March 6, 1952.

### *The Price of Beauty*

A FEW months ago, in Atlantic City, New Jersey, Miss America of 1951 was crowned. According to a recent article in *Parade*, a Sunday supplement distributed with many U. S. newspapers, \$1,000,000 was spent on the 1,000 local and State competitions which preceded the Atlantic City finale. *Parade* went on to point out that 500,000 American girls compete in the 25,000 beauty contests held annually in all parts of the country.

It occurred to us that the new Miss America, who will have twelve brief months of glory before her successor is selected next fall, is really a sort of symbol of all that the average

American girl wants to be. She is the bright-faced coed, wearing a yellow chrysanthemum and waving a pennant for the home team, who smiles out at you from the pages of the football program. She is the smartly-dressed advertising model, hatbox in hand, who strides across the covers of the picture magazines. She is the lithe-limbed, bathing-suited outdoors girl on a Florida beach. She's America's Cinderella girl. She's the queen of the prom.

The pending divorce of Liz Taylor and Nicky Hilton points out what we think is the basic fallacy of this American legend. Liz, still in her teens, enjoyed the admiration of millions of young girls who envied her looks, her charm, her screen success. Young Hilton, heir to a huge hotel fortune, was likewise handsome and successful. But the failure of their marriage might have been predicted in advance by anyone who chanced to read a statement Liz is reported to have made before the ceremony: "I just know Nicky and I will be happy," she said, "we both like hamburgers and chocolate cake."

Obviously, someone will say, there were unusual factors which contributed to the swift break-up of the Hilton-Taylor idyll: Nicky's tremendous wealth, Liz's fabulous rise to screen stardom, and over all, the ever-present lens of the newsreel camera, the bright burst of a photographer's flash bulb. And yet, all

this fame and publicity are only the inevitable results, in America, when a legend comes to life. Liz Taylor had what many American girls are striving for. It should have been more than enough to insure her happiness. The fact that it wasn't is the best proof we've seen for a very important fact: the qualities which make a girl a movie starlet or a Miss America do not necessarily make her a good wife.

What are the qualities that prepare a girl for marriage? Well, the "marriage counsellors" in the newspapers and magazines make much of "common interests," "compatibility," "similar aims" in life. We think the real answer goes a great deal deeper than these. It involves the answer to a more fundamental question: "What kind of *person* is likely to make a good wife?"

A good wife must be, first and foremost, *humble*. Does that mean she gives up her own opinions and ideas and always agrees with her husband? Of course not. It does mean that she recognizes him as the head of the house. At least as objectionable as the "sexy" comic strips, it seems to us, are those which portray the timid husband dominated by a nagging, bossy wife.

Humility in a wife is not something artificial. On the contrary, it is completely natural. In marriage a woman needs to give herself to her husband—to assume her full share

of the burden of building their life together, while at the same time realizing her need to depend on him for leadership and guidance. That's the kind of *person* she is.

Secondly, we think a good wife is able to *put material things into the right perspective*, to realize that it is far more important to the success of their marriage that her husband hold down a job in which he is satisfied than one in which he can make a large salary to give her all the modern conveniences. The girl who always has to have expensive dates, who always wants expensive clothes, who is ashamed to bring her friends home because her parents are poor, will not change overnight when she marries.

When a family gets all wrapped up in "keeping up with the Joneses," however, it is not always the fault of the wife. Many men get involved in the race for money and position, not because their wives demand it, but because their own values are confused, and it is a wife's job in this instance to do what she can to prevent their life together from becoming a ride on a merry-go-round, grabbing for the gold ring.

There is another womanly quality which, like humility and a right attitude toward material things, would do little to make a girl a winner at Atlantic City, but which is absolutely essential if she wants to be a good wife and mother. It is not easy to

pin a label on, but primarily, we suppose, it is *calmness*. For her husband and her children, a wife has to help set the tone of the home, and its tone should be one of peace.

We pointed out in this space last month that we live in a world of distractions. All day long husbands are caught up in the tensions of work, the older children bring home problems from school, the small youngsters get into difficulties with the neighborhood kids. A woman is called upon somehow to maintain an untroubled air through all of this, and to make the home a place where tempers are soothed, nerves restored and courage regained. It may be that the average woman cannot do very much, personally, to restore peace among the nations. She can do a great deal to make her home a place of peace and renewal for her family.

There are many, many marriages which are successful by ordinary standards: husband and wife get along well together, the members of the family practice their religion, the marriage does not end in divorce. But a marriage which is rooted firmly in a solid family spirituality stands head and shoulders over the run-of-the-mill union.

"Family spirituality" means something much more profound than reciting the family rosary together, praiseworthy as this practice is. There is, moreover, no set of rules

or list of "things to do" to achieve this kind of partnership, which is the deepest and most important thing a man and wife can share. Perhaps the first step is to realize that marriage is not merely a state reserved for people who do not have a religious vocation.

A Christian marriage is the union of two pilgrims on their way from birth to resurrection in Christ. In between, the cross must be carried, and the carrying must be done together. To see Christ in one another, to help bring one another closer to Him, and together to help bring into the world new sharers in His Body—to do all these things and to do them well requires the daily cultivation of virtue and the daily renunciation of self. But it is a joyful pilgrimage, and its climax is beyond this world, in future glory.

The Sacrament of Matrimony confers many graces, but it does not magically transform us into saints. A young woman has done a great deal to insure that her marriage will be successful—naturally and supernaturally—if she brings with her to the altar humility, a Christian attitude toward material things, a deep interior peace, and a thirst for closer union in Christ with her husband and future children.

Against these virtues, the points, good in themselves, but over-emphasized in the selection of a Miss America or a movie starlet, stand out

in a stark contrast. It would be a pity if young women cheated themselves and set their course by the wrong stars.—*TODAY, Chicago, Ill., November, 1951.*

### ***Facing Facts About Spain***

**H**OW far does bigotry count in the national feelings toward Spain? It is high time that this distressing fact be brought out into the open when the question of renewed cordial relations with that country comes up.

It is on the tip of all tongues that Spain is a Catholic country whenever discussions arise about agreements with Franco's Government. There are very many Americans still living who remember the part that bigotry played in forcing war between the United States and Spain in 1898. From the historical standpoint, there is no doubt that hostilities could have been honorably avoided.

We can think of no American who approves of the Franco regime. But who would take his place if he withdrew? The same Communist ene-

mies of Spain who tried to deliver Madrid to Moscow until Franco drove them out.

We are very bitter over the Chinese Reds, who have joined up with the North Koreans to butcher our boys and their UN comrades. This is a natural sentiment, but we never give a second thought to the U. S. Reds who joined up with the enemies of Spain to turn the country over to the Kremlin during the Spanish Civil War.

What is back of the grumbling about Spain? The grumblers open their arms to the unsavory Tito, who shot down Americans on an errand of mercy over his country; the same Tito who boasts that he is a better Communist than Stalin. We can find nothing in Franco's record like that.

Americans in many cases need large, economy-sized doses of tolerance. If bigotry is dictating Spanish policy, let us face it. The world will then know the evil thing in its true colors and steps can be taken to cut it out of the body politic.—*CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, Toledo, Ohio, Jan. 4, 1952.*



### ***Middle-class Communists***

Many of the middle-class intellectuals who have joined the Communists have, I believe, been driven in by what one might call a collective bad conscience, the uneasy conscience of a class which has come subconsciously to feel that the possession of any sort of privilege, arising from money, birth or education, implies a certain guilt when so many are in need. The causes of Communism are manifestly spiritual, and the only effective answers will be spiritual, too.—*Douglas Hyde in BLACKFRIARS, February, 1952.*

## Documentation

### Morality in Marriage

POPE PIUS XII

*Address given by His Holiness on November 26, 1951 to the National Congress of the "Family Front" and the Association of Large Families.*

**I**N THE natural order, among social institutions, there is none which the Church has closer to her heart than the family. Marriage, which is its root, was raised by Christ to the dignity of a sacrament. The family itself has always found, and will always find, in the Church its defense, protection and support in all that concerns its inviolable rights, its liberty and the exercise of its lofty function.

Hence it is, beloved sons and daughters, that We feel particular joy in welcoming to Our residence the National Congress of the "Family Front" and the Association of Large Families, and in expressing both Our satisfaction with your efforts towards the aims to which you aspire, and Our paternal wishes for their successful attainment.

A family movement such as yours, striving to put into full practice among the people the idea of the Christian family, and impelled both by the interior force which vivifies it, and by the needs of the people in whose midst it lives and grows, cannot fail to place itself at the service of the triple aim which is the object of your endeavors: the influence to be exercised on legislation in that vast domain which directly or indirectly affects the family; solidarity between Christian families; and the Christian culture of the family. This third objective is the fundamental one; to second and promote it the first two must concur.

We have frequently and on very diverse occasions spoken in favor of the Christian family, in most cases either to help it or to call upon others to help save it from the gravest hardships; above all, to assist it in the calamity of war. The damages caused by the first World War were far from having been fully repaired when the second even more terrible conflagration came to augment them. Much time will be needed yet, and many labors on the part of men, with even greater divine aid, before the deep wound inflicted on the family by two wars can begin to heal properly.

#### HOUSING CRISIS

Another evil, partly due to these devastating conflicts, but also a consequence of over-population and of various unsuitable or selfish tendencies, is the housing crisis. All those who endeavor to remedy this evil, be they

legislators, statesmen or social workers, perform, even if only in an indirect way, an apostolate of eminent worth. The same holds in regard to combatting the scourge of unemployment, and providing for a sufficient family wage so that the mother will not be obliged—as too often happens—to seek employment outside the home but may be able to dedicate herself more to her husband and her children. To strive on behalf of the school and religious education: this, too, is a precious contribution to the welfare of the family, as also are the fostering therein of a healthy naturalness and simplicity of habits, the strengthening of religious convictions, the development around it of an atmosphere of Christian purity, which will free it from harmful outside influences and from all those morbid incitements which give rise to disordered passions in the minds of youth.

There is a deeper misery still from which the family must be preserved, namely, the degrading bondage to which it is reduced by that mentality which tends to make of it a mere organism at the service of the social community, for the purpose of procreating for it a sufficient mass of “human material.”

### CONJUGAL MORALITY

There is, however, another danger which has been threatening the family, not merely since yesterday but for a long time, and which at its present noticeable growth could become fatal to it because it attacks the family at its very roots. We refer to the subversion of conjugal morality in its widest sense.

During these late years We have availed Ourselves of every occasion to expound one or other of the essential points of that moral doctrine, and more recently to treat of it as a whole, not only refuting the errors which corrupt it but also giving a positive demonstration of its meaning and purpose, of its importance and value for the happiness of husband and wife, as well as of the children and the entire family, for the stability and the greater good of the entire social structure from the home to the State and even to the Church.<sup>1</sup>

### LIFE OF CHILD AND MOTHER

At the center of that teaching, marriage appears as an institution at the service of life. In close connection with this principle, We have illustrated, in accordance with the constant teaching of the Church, a thesis which is one of the essential foundations not only of conjugal morality but of social morality in general: namely, that any direct attempt on an innocent human life as a means to an end—in this case to the end of saving another life—is unlawful.

Innocent human life, in whatsoever condition it is found, is withdrawn, from the very first moment of its existence, from any direct deliberate attack. This is a fundamental right of the human person, which is of universal value in the Christian conception of life; hence as valid for the life still hidden within the womb of the mother, as for the life already born and developing

<sup>1</sup> See *Catholic Mind*, Vol. L, No. 1069, pp. 49-64 (Jan. 1952).



outside of her; as much opposed to direct abortion as to the direct killing of the child before, during or after its birth. Whatever foundation there may be for the distinction between these various phases of the development of life—born or still unborn—in profane and ecclesiastical law, and as regards certain civil and penal consequences, all these cases involve a grave and unlawful attack upon the inviolability of human life.

This principle holds good both for the life of the child as well as for that of the mother. Never and in no case has the Church taught that the life of the child must be preferred to that of the mother. It is erroneous to put the question with this alternative: either the life of the child or that of the mother. No, neither the life of the mother nor that of the child can be subjected to an act of direct suppression. In the one case as in the other, there can be but one obligation: to make every effort to save the lives of both, of the mother and of the child (cf. Pius XI, "Casti Connubi," Dec. 31, 1930—*Acta Ap. Sedis* vol. 22, pp. 562-563).

It is one of the finest and most noble aspirations of the medical profession to search for ever new ways of ensuring the life of both. But if, notwithstanding all the progress of science, there still remain, and will remain in the future, cases in which one must reckon with the death of the mother, when it is the mother's wish to bring to birth the life that is within her, and not to destroy it in violation of the command of God: Thou shalt not kill!—nothing else remains for the man—who will make every effort right up to the last moment to help and save—but to bow respectfully before the laws of nature and the dispositions of Divine Providence.

But—it is objected—the life of the mother, especially the mother of a large family, is of incomparably greater value than that of a child not yet born. The application of the theory of equality of values to the case which occupies Us has already been accepted in juridical discussions.

The reply to this harrowing objection is not difficult. The inviolability of the life of an innocent human being does not depend on its greater or lesser value. It is already more than ten years since the Church formally condemned the killing of life considered to be "without value"; and whosoever knows the sad events that preceded and provoked that condemnation, whosoever is able to weigh the direful consequences that would result if one were to try to measure the inviolability of innocent life according to its value, knows well how to appreciate the motives that determined that disposition.

## TWO GREATNESSES

Besides, who can judge with certainty which of the two lives is in fact the more precious? Who can know what path that child will follow and to what heights of achievement and perfection he may reach? Two greatneses are being compared here, one of them being an unknown quantity.

In this regard We wish to cite an example which may perhaps be already known to some of you, but which notwithstanding that fact loses none of its suggestiveness. It goes back to the year 1905.

At that time there was a young lady of noble birth and of still nobler sentiments, but who was frail and of delicate constitution. As a young girl

she had been ill with a slight apical pleurisy, which seemed cured. When, however, having contracted a happy marriage, she felt a new life surging in her womb, she soon became aware of a peculiar physical indisposition, which alarmed the two able doctors who were attending her with every care and solicitude. The old apical trouble, the cicatrized lesion had become active again. In their opinion there was no time to lose. If the frail lady was to be saved, a therapeutic abortion would have to be provoked without the least delay.

The husband also realized the gravity of the case and signified his consent to the distressful act. But when the midwife in attendance duly made known the decision of the doctors and beseeched her to defer to their opinion, she replied with firm voice: "I thank you for your merciful advice; but I cannot suppress the life of my child! I cannot, I cannot! I feel it already throbbing in my womb; it has the right to live; it comes from God and should know God so as to love and enjoy Him."

Her husband also entreated, supplicated and implored her; she remained inflexible and quietly awaited the event. A baby girl was normally born; but, immediately after, the health of the mother began to get worse. The pulmonary lesion spread; the deterioration became progressive. Two months later she was at the limit of her forces. She once again saw her little child, who was growing healthily under the care of a robust nurse. Her lips broke into a sweet smile and she passed away peacefully.

Many years went by. In a religious institute a young Sister might be particularly noticed, totally dedicated to the care and education of abandoned children, bending over sick little ones, with eyes full of maternal love, as if to give them life. It was she, the daughter of the sacrifice, who now with her generous heart was doing so much good among abandoned children. The heroism of her fearless mother had not been in vain! (cfr. Andrea Majocchi, *Tra bistori o forbici* (With Surgical Knives and Scissors, 1940).

But We ask: Is it possible that Christian sensibility, even also purely human sensibility, has been dulled to the point that it cannot any longer appreciate the sublime holocaust of the mother and the visible action of Divine Providence, which brought forth such a splendid fruit from that holocaust?

### TWOFOLD EFFECT

On purpose We have always used the expression "direct attempt on the life of an innocent person," "direct killing." Because if, for example, the saving of the life of the future mother, independently of her pregnant state, should urgently require a surgical act or other therapeutic treatment which would have as a necessary consequence, in no way desired or intended but inevitable, the death of the fetus, such an act could no longer be called a direct attempt on an innocent life. Under these conditions the operation can be licit, like other similar medical interventions, granted always that a good of high worth is concerned, such as life, and that it is not possible to postpone the operation until after the birth of the child, nor to have recourse to other efficacious remedies.

Since, too, the primacy office of matrimony is to be at the service of life, the expression of Our principal gratification and of Our paternal gratitude goes to those generous mothers and fathers who, for love of God and with trust in Him, courageously raise a large family.

On the other hand, the Church knows how to consider with sympathy and understanding the real difficulties of the married state in our day. Therefore, in Our last allocution on conjugal morality, We affirmed the legitimacy and, at the same time, the limits—in truth very wide—of a regulation of offspring which, unlike so-called “birth control,” is compatible with the law of God. One may even hope (but in this matter the Church naturally leaves the judgment to medical science) that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis. The most recent information seems to confirm such a hope.

For the rest, to overcome the multiple trials of conjugal life, what is of the greatest worth is a living faith and a frequent reception of the sacraments, whence pour forth torrents of strength, of whose efficacy those living outside the Church cannot easily form a clear idea. And with this call to supernatural aid, We desire to conclude Our address. It may be, beloved sons and daughters, that one day it will fall to you to find your courage wavering under the violence of the tempest which doctrines, subversive of a healthy and normal conception of Christian marriage, unleash around you and even more dangerously in the bosom of the family. Have confidence! The energies of nature and especially the strength of grace with which Our Lord has enriched your souls in the Sacrament of Matrimony are as a firm rock against which the waves of a storm-tossed sea break powerlessly. And if the tragedies of the war and the post-war period have inflicted on marriage and the family wounds that are still bleeding, nevertheless in these years the constant faith and firm perseverance of married couples, as likewise maternal love, ever ready for untold sacrifices, have in innumerable cases won true and splendid triumphs.

With all vigor, then, carry on your work, confident in divine aid, in pledge of which We impart from Our heart to you and to your families Our paternal Apostolic Benediction.

## Justice and Charity

*Pastoral of the Spanish Archbishops dated June 3, 1951.*

**T**HE Conference of the Spanish Metropolitans, held last December, agreed unanimously to publish an instruction in which consciences of Catholics would be formed and stimulated in matters of justice and charity, the fulfillment of their respective Christian social obligations would be inculcated, and all would be exhorted to a greater

austerity of life, to curb needless expenditures, and to foster and aid all charitable works and institutions more effectively.

The regulations which the Holy See gave to the Conferences of the Spanish Metropolitans provided that decisions reached could be carried out only after obtaining at least the “*nihil obstat*,”

or—if the matter required it—the reply, of the Holy See. Since one of the matters brought up in the last conference demanded a reply from the Holy See, it has taken some months to get a complete answer on all the subjects we discussed. But this slight delay has certainly not diminished the opportuneness of the instruction, but on the contrary has given it greater urgency. Otherwise, the Church of Spain could be accused of forgetting her duties in grave and difficult times and of not giving salutary directions, without getting into technicalities where opinions differ.

### LAW OF GOD

The Law of God, you well know, dear faithful, has two tablets: one, with the first three Commandments, embraces the relations of man to God; the other deals with the relations of men among themselves, of a Christian to his neighbors. Some seek in practice, if not in theory, to mutilate the Law of God. They would be perfectly happy with a religion that imposed on them only certain pious practices and left them complete freedom to acquire and enjoy the goods of this earth. However, this is not the teaching of the Gospel or of the Apostles.

When our Lord was asked what is the first of all the Commandments, He answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind, and with thy whole strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12, 28-31). By its exalted union of man with God, the Gospel is the most divine of religions, but it is also the most human; it pre-

scribes a greater love for our neighbors—as for ourselves.

Another time when Jesus was asked: "What shall I do to gain eternal life?" it seems as if the Divine Master came to forget that the first thing necessary to gain eternal life is the love of God. He answered only: "Thou knowest the commandments: Thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not defraud, honor thy father and mother" (Mark 10, 17-19). All are precepts of the second tablet. And as the beloved disciple, St. John, said later in one of his Epistles: "How can he who does not love his brother, whom he sees, love God, whom he does not see?" (I John 4, 20).

In this instruction we are not going to speak of the precepts of the first tablet but of those of the second, and concretely—of those of justice and charity. The virtue of charity toward one's neighbor is very exalted; it is also very beautiful and attractive. But never believe that charity can take the place of justice; the latter has to go out in front and take first place. It would do a man no good at all to get rich by injustices and then pass out alms with a show and a blare of trumpets. The alms that God rewards with eternal life are those given after all justice has been fulfilled.

Utterly false is the cry of certain would-be redeemers of the worker that Christianity is content to preach charity to the rich and resignation to the poor. Resignation is a Christian virtue in the face of adversity and sorrow which we all need, rich or poor, since physical pain and moral suffering come through the doors of palaces as well as of lowly shacks. Ah! but real Christianity preaches the law of justice before alms and charity. The great Apostle of charity and love, St. John,

who reclined on the bosom of Jesus and transfused into himself the riches of the love of Christ for God and for neighbor, first anathematized every injustice: "Whoever is not just is not of God, nor is he just who does not love his brother" (I John 3, 10). So important is the virtue of justice that a saint who practices all the virtues is called just, as St. Matthew calls St. Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin and today the glorious patron of workers (Matt. 1, 19).

### OBLIGATIONS OF JUSTICE

Justice is classically divided into legal, distributive and commutative justice. "Social justice," of which His Holiness Pope Pius XI spoke in *Quadragesimo Anno*, and which is used so commonly today in discussing social questions, can be reduced to one of these three. Legal justice obliges the individual to respect the common good and consequently to fulfill just laws. Vice versa, distributive justice obliges superiors to distribute burdens and rewards rightly among individuals. A great part of what is understood today by social justice comes in here. Commutative justice obliges the individual to give to others with perfect equality what is due to them by strict right. This refers especially to all kinds of contracts. Every man—subjects, superiors, equals—is held to fulfill his obligations of justice. In legal justice, subjects must fulfill their obligations to constituted authority by not stirring up seditions and by keeping just laws.

But the obligations of justice exist no less for superiors than they do for subjects. On the contrary, what tremendous obligations of justice superiors have—of distributive justice, of social justice. Those who govern have different attributes according to the different forms of government and ac-

cording to the different constitutions of the people. The Church respects these different forms of government so long as they are not contrary to natural law and so long as they respect the rights of the Church instituted by Jesus Christ. But no human power is unlimited. Even the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the Roman Pontiff is limited by what is established by divine law, either natural or positive. All civil power, even the highest, is likewise limited by natural law. It has to respect the natural rights of the human person and the family, which precede those of the State. Those who govern have a most grave obligation of justice to procure the common good of society; society exists not for those who govern, but they exist for society.

### LIBERALISM

Liberalism undermined civil authority not by placing its immediate origin in society—as far as the determination of the form of government is concerned. Rather, Liberalism undermined civil authority by placing the ultimate basis of authority itself not in God, but in a contract with the people and by recognizing liberties contrary to the common good and to divine or natural law.

As an extreme opposed to Liberalism, modern totalitarianism comes along to hand over absorbing, unlimited powers to the state authority without any respect for the natural rights of the human person. It changes the State from a means necessary to obtain the common good of society into the end of society itself. Our own noted Balmes taught that civilization consisted in procuring the greatest possible understanding for the greatest possible number, the greatest possible morality for the greatest possible number, the best well-being for the greatest possible number.

Totalitarian Communist states repre-

sent the greatest antagonist to this concept of true civilization. In them, the State is the lord of everything: of power, of the land, of capital. The individual is left with neither property nor money nor freedom. Every kind of totalitarianism, even a mitigated one, goes on despoiling the individual to the benefit of the State. It ignores, if not wholly, then at least partially, the laws of justice pertaining to the State, and along with the State, those pertaining to rulers.

### WORK CONTRACTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Even in free contracts between individuals, justice should be respected. The most fundamental idea for the redemption of the worker, contained in the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII, is the teaching that a work contract between management or the employer and the worker should respect justice. Consequently, a salary does not solely depend on what the employer and worker have freely contracted for. Rather since there is always a question of the only pay a normal worker has, and since it is the only means he has to sustain his life, it should be sufficient for that end. Anything else is unjust even though the worker contracted for it, forced to do so by necessity.

Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno*, drawing a legitimate consequence from the principle established by his predecessor Leo XIII, made it clear that social justice demands just wages not for the individual alone, but, in the case of an adult worker, a true family wage—so that it will not be necessary for the wife to leave home and work outside, or for the children to go to work before the proper age. The same Pius XI, in his encyclical *Casti Conubii* insisted that if the ends of mar-

riage are to be attained, "it is not lawful to establish wages so small that when circumstances are considered, they are not enough to support a family." These pontifical teachings are an echo of the curse of St. James against wage thieves: "Behold, the wages of the laborers who reaped your fields, which have been kept back by you unjustly, cry out; and their cry has entered into the ears of the Lord of Hosts" (James 5, 4). In this connection, it is appropriate to praise the legislation of the new Spanish State for establishing a family wage.

Contracts of buying and selling should be regulated by just prices. In the absence of a just law, the just price cannot be inflexible, because in such contracts (of buying and selling) justice permits a minimum, medium and maximum price. However, to sell at a price that is higher than the just price set by law, or higher than the maximum according to a fair estimate, violates commutative justice and demands restitution. The same principles that apply to buying and selling also apply to rents and loans. Consequently, excessive rents and loans at a usurious rate of interest can violate commutative justice.

The foregoing teachings taken from Sacred Scripture, from the Papal encyclicals, and commonly taught by theologians and moralists have to be applied to the circumstances of war and post-war, characterized by high costs of living.

Wars that may be just and necessary to defend one's country, even legitimate crusades in defense of the Faith and religion, are always a very grave evil because of the victims they produce, the destruction they cause, the disorders that spring up so easily, and finally the impoverishment that comes out of them. For this reason the Church

prays in the Litany of the Saints: "*A peste, fame et bello, libera nos, Domine.*"

Christian ethics and natural law must have, and do have, their norms of justice to determine when a war is just or unjust and to safeguard justice even in its midst. But do not such norms also exist for the high cost of living, for production shortages, for the tortures of hunger in the post-war era? Justice has to be maintained in all circumstances of human life for individuals and societies. With her office of teacher the Church has to be a teacher in these circumstances where gravest obligations of justice are precisely most urgent, and where, on the other hand, there are incentives and opportunities to trample them underfoot—with the danger of many souls being lost, and the material and moral ruin and misery of not a few.

### THE COMMON GOOD

How the obligations of public authority swell and press down when there is a shortage of the most necessary products, such as food; when a high cost of living is caused by an inflation that completely changes the purchasing power of money, which is its true real value! The principal mission of public authority is to procure the common good, and, in the first place, this includes the sustenance of individuals. Therefore, the State should see to it that work is not lacking for those who derive their sole means of support from work, that the basic needs of life are not wanting, and that they can be obtained with the wages paid for the work.

This is the primary necessity to which everything else in the material order has to be subjected. This gives the right of State intervention in so far as it is necessary and useful. In normal

times, prices are regulated by market transactions themselves. However, in times of production shortages, inflation and high cost of living a legal ceiling price is advisable which assures the producer fair profit but, at the same time, prevents any abuses through taking advantage of shortages to extort prices which are higher than the just maximum and which make the goods inaccessible to the masses. The State should prevent collusions, hoardings and monopolies that try to impose a higher price than the just maximum. State authorities ought to make arrangements to prevent shortages in the primary necessities of life—not only food, but clothing and other things.

It is not the Church's mission to descend to technical and economic methods, about which opinions vary at times. But it certainly is the State's obligation to consult competent technicians, to get collaboration from experts, from municipalities, and from professional groups, and to find out by experience whether the means used brought good results or not. Finally, the State must exact rigorous fidelity from subordinate officials, for the greater their number the more difficult it is to select them and entrust them with such important affairs; and in addition, it is harder to maintain an orderly vigilance. These subordinate officials can sin twice against justice, both if they harm the State and if they harm citizens unjustly.

### THE ABUSES OF SPECULATORS CRY TO HEAVEN

If the State has solemn obligations in times of shortages, sellers equally have them under such circumstances. They certainly have the right to derive from their work a just reward that will spur them on. But a cry goes to heaven



that some are trying to take advantage of the shortages to amass great fortunes by selling at prices beyond the just maximum—at the price of the blood of those who are forced to buy, as His Holiness Pope Pius XII has severely noted. We cannot lose our consciences to secure unjust increases. For example, when there is a five per cent rise in wages, taxes cannot justly be raised ten per cent or prices increased in greater proportions. This hurts not only the individual buyer but the common good, by increasing inflation and hastening the depreciation of money.

Under ordinary circumstances inflation always claims its victims. When the purchasing power of money goes down, its real value is changed and general impoverishment results. Anyone with plenty of capital or income can withstand this impoverishment, because all it means to him is a reduction of his fortune. He goes on swelling his assets though not in proportion to the inflation. But family life is very hard for a man who draws only slim wages—even though he does receive a raise, if it is not in proportion to the rise in the cost of living.

But there are always those who receive no adjustment whatsoever for the increase in the cost of living. They are the main victims of inflation. They are those without work, poor widows and orphans who depend on tiny pensions, cloistered nuns who live on small dowries, pious foundations which cannot increase their capital and, therefore, can care only for a greatly reduced number of aged, sick and children—if they can go on operating at all. So, if at times of high cost of living the obligations of justice must be discharged, there still remain, quite apart from them, the obligations of charity.

The law of the Gospel prescribes that we are to love our neighbor as our-

selves for the love of God. Consequently, we have to do for each one of our neighbors what we would want him to do for us, if we were in his situation. We see in him the image of Jesus Christ, since He put Himself in the person of our neighbor in want. When describing the Last Judgment, He taught us that He would call blessed of His Father and place at His right hand those who had helped the poor, and that He would reject as cursed, condemning them to eternal punishment, those who had denied help to the needy. He gave the following explanation: "As long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me, and as long as you did it not for one of these least ones, you did not do it for me" (Matt. 25, 31-46). With reason did that saint of charity, St. John of God, cry to the rich: "Give alms, practise charity—to yourselves." In times of job shortages, lack of food and clothing, let us not close up or harden our hearts, but recall the words of St. James: "Judgment is without mercy to him who has not shown mercy" (James 2, 13).

### PRACTISE AUSTERITY

Let us try, above all, not to exasperate the poor and needy by a contrast of luxury and dissipation. In hard times, in times of shortages, all—individuals and organizations—have the obligation of practising austerity. Let us contribute to the Church's beneficent works; to the St. Vincent de Paul Conferences; to the parochial and diocesan Secretariates of Charity. The Lord rewards charity performed by individuals. The Church praises the charity practised by the State, by deputies, by municipalities, by state institutions. But no one claims a monopoly on charity. As long as she has existed, the Church has practised charity in her own right,



by herself and by her institutions. To persecute the Church means to impede her beneficent work, and it is for this aim that in our own times persecutions have begun in some Communist states. The field of charity is inexhaustible for everyone who wants to labor in it.

This instruction and these exhortations have been dictated to us by our duty to teach, and by our love of the Spanish people. This love embraces all: the rulers and the ruled, the learned and the unlearned, the rich and poor—even the enemies of the Church, for if any of them are in want, for them, too, we ask justice and charity. After the salvation of each and every soul, we desire nothing more ardently than social peace in our most beloved Spain. But according to the words chosen by His Holiness Pope Pius XII for his motto, *Opus iustitiae pax*, peace is the fruit of justice. May all cooperate to obtain it, may this collaboration not be hindered, and may the remaining gaps be filled up with abundant and generous charity.

#### PREOCCUPATION OF THE CHURCH WITH SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The Church was founded by Jesus Christ to continue His mission on earth; that mission is supernatural, and its end is the salvation of souls. May nothing hinder her mission and may she not try to do what does not belong to her. The Church has no material force; her means are teaching and the administration of the Sacraments. She is not always heard, not even by those who call themselves Catholics; but peacefully and faithfully she follows her mission, whatever be the circumstances. Her action is not instantaneous, but she never stops seizing the opportune moment, late or early.

In a recent radio message to Spanish

employers, technicians and workers, His Holiness Pope Pius XII said: "No one can accuse the Church of being disinterested in the condition of the workers and the social question, or of having failed to give them due importance. Few questions have preoccupied the Church as much as these two have since, 60 years ago, our great predecessor Leo XIII, with his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, put the *magna charta* of their rights into the workers' hands. The Church has been and is fully conscious of her responsibility. In the Church the social question is not insoluble, but neither can she solve it by herself, without collaboration from intellectual, economic and technical forces and from public powers . . . It is the custom to accuse the Christian faith of consoling mortals who are fighting for a living with the hope of Heaven. The Church, we are told, has no idea of how to help man live on this earth. Nothing is more false."

Certainly, nothing is more false, since this (to help man live on earth) is exactly the boast of so many of her children consecrated to the heroism of helping the sick and infirm, to popular education (which the Church was the first to introduce) and even to higher education. This is her boast as Balmes shows in his capital work *Protestantism*, where he portrays the beneficent influence of the Church in the development of European civilization.

The action of the recent Roman Pontiffs, in their social encyclicals, so proclaims this interest that Leo XIII was able to affirm in his encyclical *Immortale Dei* that the Church, with the end of guiding and conducting men to eternal happiness, influences society so beneficently that she seems to have no other end than temporal welfare. She, custodian of the revelation of Jesus Christ and continuer of His mission,

gives meaning to temporal life itself. What she teaches us to pray for to God is that "we may so pass through temporal goods as not to lose eternal ones" (Prayer for the 3rd Sunday after Pentecost).

*On the third Sunday after Pentecost, June 3, 1951. For the Conference of the Spanish Metropolitans. Enrique, Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, President—Balbino, Archbishop of Granada, Secretary.*

## Spanish Ambassador to the Holy See

POPE PIUS XII

*An address by His Holiness on November 13, 1951, to the new Spanish Ambassador to the Holy See, Fernando Castiella y Maiz.*

**A**FTER the unexpected return home of your illustrious and exceptionally meritorious predecessor, in order to occupy a high place in the government of your country, Your Excellency has been chosen by the confidence of the Chief of State as the representative before Us of that Spanish people which is always so dear to Our heart.

Therefore, on solemnly commencing your mission here—where so imposing a number of states from all parts of the world, and of the most diverse forms of government maintain their diplomatic representation—We wish to give you Our most paternal and cordial welcome, expressing at the same time the conviction that the faithful and Catholic people of Spain will accompany the mission which Your Excellency begins in the center of Christendom with the most lively satisfaction and the most heartfelt and sincere approval. . . .

Your Excellency is not ignorant of the outlook that the world of today presents, not only because you are a worthy scion of a family in which the old Iberian stock interlaces with the modern branches that have budded in the fertile soil of the New World, but also because you have come directly from that same hemisphere where 20 nations, speaking the one same language, and invoking the same, the only God, are—as has been well said—making of history something present and vibrant, something that never dies.

This human experience, enriching the learning acquired in the most famous schools of your native land and abroad, together with the practical knowledge acquired in a life much more intense than long, above all in the field of international law, must have made Your Excellency aware of the tragic characteristic of our day. This consists in the disparity between the juridical principles that proclaim as the longed-for goal the peaceful community of the peoples, and the political reality that seems to block the road, makes the goal ever more remote, and even creates the risk of never reaching it at all.

Whoever is not determined to combat such a frightful discrepancy and to overcome it in his field of action has no place among the authentic, the sincere fighters for peace, because his works against peace itself suffice to

disprove his pacifistic words. And whoever is not disposed to recognize the moral supremacy of the problem of peace in all its aspects is turning his gaze away from that which is the principal task of humanity; is deliberately ignoring an urgent duty that weighs on each and every man as well as on the nations; is closing his eyes not only to the light of a specific problem of the whole human community but also to the splendors of an essential function of the Christian faith for the formation of a society penetrated by the spirit of Jesus Christ.

Too many years have already passed with humanity and Christianity wavering along the unstable line that separates the desire for peace and the fear of war—fear of a war which, though it does not seem imminent, by a most understandable psychological reflex drives all, rulers and ruled, to an armaments race, with economic and social consequences that must frighten every clear-sighted spirit.

No one views such an ominous spectacle with more bitter and sorrowful preoccupation than does the common Father of Christendom. No one sees with more horror than He the unspeakable afflictions and calamities, the frightful catastrophes in both the material and moral order, that would break loose upon humanity, should it not soon succeed in filling up again that abyss of mutual distrust and well-founded reciprocal fear which is opening between nations and the groups of nations.

#### STRIVE FOR MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

All, taught by bitter experience, unfortunately know that, in the hard reality of the present hour, even the most sincere love of peace cannot overlook alert vigilance against the danger of unjust aggression. But above all, there is one end toward which all must strive who consider themselves members of the community of Christian peoples and of the states that live on a moral basis: that of doing everything humanly possible to fill the abyss which has been dug in the living flesh of the human race. And when for the moment it is not possible to reach definitive solutions, it will be necessary at least to favor all partial, sincere solutions, even though they be gradual, and then to wait with patience and vigilance that the dawn of brighter days may break when world and public opinion, in an atmosphere more tranquil and serene, will be better prepared for mutual understanding.

There cannot be the least doubt about the place that belongs to Spain in this struggle undertaken for the most noble purposes. Your Excellency comes from the very lands toward which were turned the dying eyes of the great Isabella, whose centenary is celebrated this year, that singular spirit from whom in these moments we would wish to evoke not so much her strength or political vision, as the maternal anxieties for peace, dictated by a profoundly Christian concept of life, that sought for those she called her children from America a treatment full of sweetness and devotion. What the Spanish apostles preached in Peru and all America; what her philosophers and theologians taught at Salamanca, Alcala and Trent; what her poets sang in inspired lines; what her saints proclaimed by their exemplary lives; what her martyrs of all times testified heroically—are stars in the

sky of history, whose light can never be withheld by the dark but artificial clouds raised by the spirit of evil.

Under the pressure of opinion or of transitory currents, the living and vital bond that unites old Spain with the rest of the community of nations can be temporarily forgotten or undervalued. But We beg Heaven that the hour be not delayed in which the dissonances and differences of today will be transformed into a fruitful harmony of purposes and activities—fruit of harmonious human labor and the gift of heaven—by virtue of which humanity, so tormented by the futile discord, will gain peace based on justice and fidelity, sustained by sublime moral inspirations and realized in a spirit of cordial brotherhood.

With such a consoling hope, We invoke upon the most beloved Spanish people, on whom We always rely, upon those who guide her destinies, and upon Your Excellency, the light and the protection of the Most High, while with all Our heart, We give to you and also to your distinguished family, and to Our faithful sons in Spain, the Apostolic Blessing.



### *Learning from History*

Justice and liberty are qualities of the human heart. They will not down. They may be curbed for a time but they will return to haunt their oppressor. A change is coming. We can do much to make it a peaceful change, a change which will shape the world closer to the standards of Christ. In Europe during the last century the Church lost that opportunity—with today's unhappy results. —Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly in *SOCIAL ACTION BULLETIN* (Hartford, Conn.), March 15, 1952.

## THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett      EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

